Current Situation of the Jihadi Movement

Ahmed Al-Hamdan

Current Situation of the Jihadi Movement

Open Interview With Ahmed Al-Hamdan

Foreword



I have written the series titled (Current Situation of the Jihadi Movement) in a discontinuous manner and it continued for a year. Since 1st of April 2017 until the 3rd of April 2018, originally it was a collection of questions and their answers from certain people and I saw the appropriate opportunity to translate and publish these in the English language, and that because the Anglophones – perhaps- lacked the availability of basic references, of which most are in Arabic, and would need it more than those for which the original references suffice and could understand it without translation.

Most questions as is very clear were about (The Islamic State), because this group perhaps benefited most from translating their productions and publishing them in the English language, therefor those that speak this language would speak about them more, let alone their expansion and their reach to many jihad arenas, this is what caused that most questions would surround it.

I saw it appropriate to collect this subject in one file, especially with the deletion of links of these parts in a systematic and repeated manner.

I also liked to note that the reviewers of this subject are many, and not merely a single person, therefor you might see a difference between the translation of one answer and another answer, I also liked to thank the brothers in Al Muwahideen Media whom contributed to the review of a part of this series.

And meet you soon in another project In Sha Allah.

Ahmad Al-Hamdan

21st April 2018

__Question:__ **Were there any objections from jihadi personalities regarding the operations of Al-Qaeda in Saudi Arabia?**

The answer: Yes there were objections, from the senior mujahideen within Saudi and some from outside, the situation in Saudi almost lost hold and derailed.

And that because the security forces tried to stop any attempt against their western allies, with that the course of the battle changed from targeting the westerners to clashes with the local security forces. Many scholars and preachers who support and sympathize with jihad don't see these actions as permissible; even if he saw this as permissible originally, but they see it as impermissible when the consequences are corrupt.

Your entering in this battle made the people delay in themselves giving support to you, the reality is that the war of the USA on Afghanistan and Iraq generated large empathy and sway from a part of the people to the mujahideen. Because this war is understood and clear, but when a battle happens which he does not understand and sees it as believers against believers, he would withdraw his sympathy from the jihadi faction and takes the stance of the enemy or the uncaring (about the affair).

As for the personalities whom objected to this operation, from the most notable among them:

- Shaykh Atiyyatullah al-Lībī when saying: (**As for Riyadh, the bombing in it ,without a doubt, do not recognize its legitimacy. And most of the scholars and preachers do not see it as legitimate, stopping this operation would not in any situation disrupt the jihad!! This is a mistake we disallow, and an expansion we renounce**!)[1].

- And also Shaykh Sulaymān Al-'Ulwān in a letter (The reality of jihad and the internal events) And this letter I specify it to one of the notable personalities in Al-Qaeda organization in Saudi to respond to it and he is Sultan ibn Bajaad al-'Utaybī in the message with the title:(a quiet debate with Al-'Ulwān).

- Also Shaykh Abu 'Umar AlSayf, The judge of the Arab mujahideen in Chechnya, published a letter urging the brothers to target the US bases in the gulf, but when he saw the course of the battle was not like this he published an audio message (To the mujahideen in Saudi) and said: (**And I advise the brothers around this age to do that which has benefits and to head towards Iraq instead of busying themselves with confrontations with the government of Saudi**). Commander in Al-Qaeda Salih Al'Aufi replied in the magazine "Voice of Jihad" on this call and said: (**I and the required brothers firmly refuse to go to Iraq**)[2].

---

[1] The Complete Works of Shaykh Atiyyatullah al-Lībī - Page 1380.
[2] magazine: Voice of jihad, Issue 8, Page 25.

- Shaykh Nasir Al-Fahd said: (**As for confronting the state (saudi arabia) I used to advise the brothers to stay away from it because of the inequality in power and that the state will use these events to finish off the brothers one after the other and will fill the prisons with them and with others, and what I expected happened exactly like I thought**)[3].

- And a personality close to Shaykh Usamah ibn Laden sent him a letter in which they objected to the military work in Saudi Arabia (which is the letter nr.: SOCOM-2012-0000018 in the Abottabad documents).

These were the most notable people that objected.

- **Note:** One of the best book regarding Al-Qaeda organization in Saudi Arabia in the English language is (Jihad in Saudi Arabia: Violence and Pan-Islamism since 1979) by the author (Thomas Hegghammer), this because of two reasons, firstly that the researcher was proficient in the Arabic language and secondly because his proficiency in Arabic he laid bare the official sources that were published by Al-Qaeda in Saudi Arabia and he read the information directly without medium. It is one of the best book published in this field whether in the Arabic or the English language.

[3] Retraction from the alleged retraction – Page 4.

<u>Question:</u> What is your opinion regarding the leaks of Wikileaks on the subject of Spy agencies hacking many devices and phones?

<u>The answer:</u> I have the conviction that merely using technology in secret work will compromise you, and the more primitive means of communications you use the more you will be far from being spied on or followed!

Large countries such as Russia, China and the US spend millions of dollars on espionage systems and protection from infiltration, even then they still infiltrate each other! And they use the newest devices and technologies and they are used by the most notable and skilled technicians in the country!

How can a mujahid, maybe he doesn't know much about technology and maybe doesn't even use an antivirus, and when he uses it he'll use the freeware! If you could hack fortified systems then for sure you could hack this person with ease!

Shaykh Usamah knew that the west is superior on the field of technology, surveillance and spying, thus he utterly forbade using the internet and even programs specific to send secret messages to use on external operations or big issues.

He said: (**As for anything dangerous, we should never use any modem devices, especially for the external operations. Also, just because something can be encrypted doesn't make it suitable for use. The enemy can easily monitor all incoming letters to areas where there are Mujahidin and can access all their messages. As you know, this science is not ours and is not our invention. That means we do not know much about it. Based on this, I see that sending any dangerous matter via encrypted email is a risky thing. It is expected that whoever made the program can open the encrypted letters no matter how it's encrypted.**

Encrypting a message is done so that the general public is not able to open the message)[4].

And he said in another point: (**With respect to the communication over the internet,. However, even with what the brothers had mentioned regarding al-Asrar al- Mujahidin program, the secrecy of the external work does not allow its use. I recommend confirming with the interested brothers that the external work would only be through the trusted messengers**)[5].

Even if the Shaykh did not forbid internet or using devices or phones to communicate completely but he did forbid it in highly secret and dangerous issues.

---

[4] Document: 432-10-CR-019-S-4-RJD-Original.

[5] Letter to Shaykh Mahmud 26 September 2010.

‘Abdullah Al’Adam, responsible for security in Al-Qaeda, said: (**Al-Qaeda has returned to the stone age regarding its communications operations as if we are using homing pigeons, this of course helps misinform the enemy and bar him from reaching the places of the mujahideen, and stops him from locating and identifying their locations. And if there was anything we have our specific ways to give information to each other. As for the communications means, that try to identify us, we are the farthest people from using it**)[6].

[6] Series creating terrorism, lesson:11.

<u>Question From Tore Hamming:</u> what do you know about the initial opposition within Al-Qaeda to the 9/11 attacks and to focus on the west instead of local regimes? I know Saif Al'Adl, Abu Al Yazid and Abu Hafs Al Mauritani were against the attack. Do you know if anyone else were?

<u>The answer:</u> Yes, like Shaykh Abu al-Walid al-Ansari, I have (an unpublished) letter from him speaking to one of the leaders: (**although the attacks of 9/11 was the disobedience, without a doubt if it was without the permission of the imam**).

As for the attacks of 9/11, it seems there was confusion or lack of clarity from Al-Qaeda to the Taliban.

The commander of Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, whom is Shaykh Abu Baseer al-Wuhayshi, was a companion to Shaykh Osama bin Laden and he has a memo titled: (The untold tale of the 9/11 event), in it he said that Shaykh Osama sent pictures of the victims in Palestine to Mullah Umar, when he looked at them he became angered and sad. He requested Shaykh Osama to do an operation against the Jews, and said: I will God willing.

Mullah Umar said (the Jews) but Shaykh Osama said: (as for permission from the Leader of the Believers, he gave it to hit the Jews. And the Americans are the other face of the Jews).

There seemed to be an interpretation exceeding what the Taliban permitted!

As for the Taliban they said Jews only, but Al-Qaeda said Jews and Americans are no different from each other!

As for Abu Hafs al-Mauritani (he was one of the few that brought us the news of ongoing internal discussions of Al-Qaeda deciding about 9/11). Me personally do not think he is reliable, one of the members of the shariah committee wrote in the forum of Tawheed and Jihad (Shaykh Abdullah Al-Shanqitee) a message titled (Did Abu Hafs al-Mauritani retreat? or did Al-Qaeda get infiltrated?)

And the man came with Abu Hafs al-Mauritani' old comments and words completely contradicting what he says now, and these contradictions are in this manner (I do not support this and I do not do this and I absolutely did not say this) but his old comments are completely opposite of this.

This person is confused in his testimony, therefore I do not rely on what he says.

Also Jihadi groups that were in Afghanistan and their projects were to fight in their own countries only, also opposed it, because these attacks forced them to enter in a war against an enemy they did not see a priority in fighting against.

Shaykh Muhammad Al-Hasum spoke to me and said: When I was in Afghanistan after 9/11, Abu Musab al-Suri came to relay the standpoint of Shaykh Usamah to the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group, Shaykh Abu Laith al-Libi was severe in his response on him and was angered from this conduct.

The Libyan group had a strategy built on a Quranic verse which said: [Fight those of the unbelievers who are near to you].

And this is a strategic disagreement, Al-Qaeda which says that the far enemy has more priority, thats why we find that Al-Qaeda used to contradict the other groups a bit roughly. Like Shaykh Yusuf Al'Uyayri ,and he was one of the most notable leaders of Al-Qaeda, said:

(**The Jihadi movement that are committed to "this is my land I I have to fight in it and they say [Fight those of the unbelievers who are near to you] and use this as evidence. These words are incorrect, not lawfully nor logically. For what did the jihadi movement in Libya accomplish? It didn't accomplish anything and it failed**)[7].

Shaykh Atiyyatullah al-Lībī has an answer... which can have two meanings (means either agreement or disagreement) and it is an answer somewhat suggesting the existence of mistake. But do we sit and blame Shaykh Usamah or do we help him regardless of our disagreement with him?![8].

Fazul Abdullah Mohammed secret ameer of Al-Qaeda also when he said: (**And if someone would ask me my opinion during the time of the operation, then I am with Shaykh Abu Muhammad Al-Masri who used to see that any other big attack on the americans would harm the Islamic Emirate even if you asked me before or after the operation. For me to choose the authority of Ameer Almu'mineen staying or doing the operation then I would have chosen the staying of the Islamic Emirate because it was a great benefit for everyone**)[9].

There is a marginal issue which relates to making a decision on the attack, it was a fierce discussion between the jihadi groups about restricting capacities within the administrative structure, which is the issue of (Is shūrā mandatory or optional?) .

Meaning: If a shūrā council unanimously or the majority made a decision must the Leader then obey or does he have a choise?! But we will speak about this soon God willing.

Concluding: There are important brackets inside the jihadi movement which opposed 9/11 not because they saw it impermissible in essence, but because of its consequences. Not everyone who opposes the operation is a traitor or is misguided or hates the mujahideen!

---

[7] Lecture: Guerrilla warfare.
[8] return to his words on "Answers of Al Hisbah - Page 23".
[9] Memos of Fadil Fazoul (1/1270).

Question: **Don't some jihadi groups worship public support aside Allah?! And whoever seeks to please people by angering Allah, Allah will be angry with him and will cause people to be angry with him – As came in the hadith-?**

The answer: Firstly: We must know that public support is an important issue for the success of the jihad movement in their battles. When they were fighting the local governments and the armed struggle failed, they asked themselves: What are the reasons of our failure? Collectively they agreed that one of the reasons of failure was that they entered in an elitist battle, which made it easier for these governments to single out and gradually finish us off. However if they had public support in the battle this issue would have been more difficult because points of engagement would spread the area of battle. Leave the mujahideen and let's take a look at the shiites, because in some gulf countries you see them engaging in security battles against these governments. The shiites don't take action and move like an elitist organization isolated from its own sect, but they are a populist organization supported by the entire sect , you'll find that the government has great difficulty to monitor an entire sect! Whilst if the organization was merely a small group from a sect it is easier to identify, finish off, and eliminate its dangers.

Secondly: A number of jihadi scholars complemented public support and its importance to the battle, and we will discuss their sayings. For example the saying of Shaykh 'Abdullah 'Azzam: (**The jihadi movement represents a fuse that detonates tons of explosives, the people are the explosives, an islamic movement can't fight a long during war against even a small country, let alone to stand long years facing a large country. And a movement which isolates itself from the people have sentenced themselves to death, like a branch, if cut from a tree, however big and ripe it was, it will wither and die**)[10].

Shaykh Usamah ibn Laden said something in the same proximity: (**if the specific individuals had a role which nobody else fulfills, then the commoners are the real fuel of the battle, and its explosive material, and the role of the specific individuals are like a fuse and incentive which detonates this material**)[11].

In another place he said: (**The people for the movement is like water for the fish, any movement that loses the sympathy of the people, its defensive power weakens continuously until the movement vanishes**)[12].

Shaykh Majid Al Majid, commander of the 'Abdullah 'Azzam battalions group, in his message to Abū Yaḥyā al-Lībī said: (**By experience we confirmed that jihadi work mostly needs strong**

---

[10] Jihad Magazine – Issue 37 – Rabi' AlThani 1408h corresponding to december 1987g.
[11] 2Audio Message: After a year about the american failure in Afghanistan, October 2002.
[12] Abbottabad Documents, Document Nr: SOCOM-2012-0000016.

public support, helping it in outlining goals and means, so that they don't turn over to the ranks of its enemy or at the least: against itself)[13].

The head of security in Al Qaeda 'Abdullah Al'Adam says: (**The secret to the success of jihadi movement work as a whole and its continuation on a form that guarantees establishing a state and achieves the intended goals of jihad, exists from many sides strongly in the relation between the citizens and the fighting mujahideen, for the support from the believing commoners to the armed jihadi work, is from the important foundations for the survival of the jihadi soul and its continuation**) [14].

Abū Muṣʿab Al-Suri: (**The purpose of preaching is the mobilization of the people on the truth and on this battle, when you lose this key, you come with the first reason for failure, rather the fundamental reason of failure. Because its a law Allah Almighty put in place, it was experienced and discovered by people through experience. The one who is affectionate and mobilizes the people on the truth gains. And Allah Almighty is capable of giving victory without people nor preaching, but in the world of motives we devote ourselves to win the hearts of the people to win the battles**)[15].

Shaykh Yūsuf al-`Iyairī said: (**For you are not fighting on your own, you are fighting like a peoples movement, you need to pull this peoples movement with you, you need to convince the people, that they become your base, and if you work on your own you'll find nobody to support you and then you will fall**) [16].

Leader of Al-Qaeda in Saudi Arabia, Abdel Aziz al-Muqrin said: (**Therefor upon every emerging movement or group that wants to start a successful guerrilla warfare they should be aware to the issue of the commoners ...the people and fulfilling their rights, their demands, living among them and sharing their griefs and joys. If a movement reaches this level then the acceptance from the people is realized and this is what we call the peoples response**)[17].

Concluding with the words of Atiyyatullah al-Lībī: (**Then it is with the worldly and religious standards. If the leaders and people of a political revolutionary altering project succeed if they don't work to gain the people from the commoners, the communities, the people . And win them over, affectioning and embracing them. And how can they request their project and revolution to be successful if the people hate them and every day shake them off?!**)[18].

---

[13] Letter to Shaykh Abū Yaḥyā al-Lībī – Page 8.
[14] The Awakening council of apostasy and the way to prevent it – Page 8.
[15] Administration and organization of guerrilla warfare – Page 21.
[16] Audio file: Guerrilla warfare.
[17] Training camp Al Battar Magazine, third issue, Page 21.
[18] To my brothers, the leaders of the mujahideen – Page6, Al-Sahab Foundation.

He also said in another instance: (**And I will speak to you more about embracing, supporting, affectioning, beautifying the people etc. This oh brother is the largest means to victory and conquest, not diminished by military work, rather it is the essence and military work should be a servant and complementary to it. When you embrace the people and embrace them with your ethics, good words, tending and your upbringing, you then have gained the largest means to victory on your enemy by Allahs' will. And when the people love you and magnify you with love and adoration, and Allah makes their hearts affectionate towards you. This would be the most successful and correct to your word and preserving to you from every affliction the enemy plans for you**)[19].

And there are many others whom have mentioned the importance of involving the people in the battle and making them a protection for the jihadi groups. This issue has been confirmed generation after generation by the leaders of jihadi movements successively. This after many failed experiences and their evaluation. They attached the necessity of revolutionizing the people with the leadership of these people to be in the hands of the mujahideen elite. But on the contrary to this you find that the extremists hate this issue, and they discredit the person that does it. For example Shaykh Atiyyatullah al-Lībī said and he recounts his personal experience with the GIA":

(**it was that indicated level, the affectionate level, and its influential owned bad mannered, it does not represent Islam honorably. Violence, severity, regidity in their conduct with the people, lacking in the aspects of mercy and pity on the creation, and amnesty for mistakes, lack of respect for the people of preference, including…**

A combination of heart and moral illnesses like arrogance, vanity and superiority…! We ask Allah wellbeing and safety, And some expressions became known to them like " There is no affection in jihad", it became their method.! Some even informed that they used to vilify with what they called the Algerianized innovation with:" They have affection, intending to vilify them with their affection towards the people and their mercy and pity and embracing them and so on. And they were the level indicated to from the group and who were orbiting them)They do not care about the people, and they criticize those who talk about embracing them.!)[20].

Imagine that today there are those who say the same things! In the same mannerism and the same method and the same situation!

For example the Islamic State rejects the one embracing and gaining the people and changing them with affection. Therefor they did not treat the people in the areas they took over with

[19] Letter to Abū Muṣʿab al-Zarqāwī – Page7.
[20] Answers of Al-Hisba – Page 177-178.

something they reject for themselves. What led to the people of these areas not wanting to join their project nor support them. And thats why you see Abū Bakr al-Baghdadi for example saying in one of his speeches criticizing with discontentment the sunnis of Iraq because they didn't fight with him: (**Oh People of Sunnah in Iraq: Will you every time have no sense?? Did you get used to humiliation and inferiority until you stopped caring and strayed like the people of Israel strayed before you!**)[21].

Second point: Does gaining and embracing the people go with leaving obligatory shar'i issues?!

Answer: No, but it goes with leaving the allowed issues and the issues that can be delayed, Shaykh Abū Muḥmmad al-Maqdisī said: (**And beware of oppressing the Syrian people or infringing on their rights or estranging and pressuring them on ijtihad issues or issues that can be tolerated or appeasing the people and delaying (some judgments that would cause more corruption if applied); for the conspiracy against them is great thus they should plant their love in the hearts if the Syrian people with manners, sacrifice and mercy to them**)[22].

Note that the Shaykh warned the mujahideen to be harsh on ijtihad issues and issues that can be delayed or tolerated and not all issues!!!

You will find certain issues that the prophet peace be upon him did not do taking into account the understanding and minds of the people, for example:

1. Like the saying of our Prophet peace be upon him said to Ayesha may Allah be pleased with her: (Had your people not been unbelievers in the recent past (had they not quite recently accepted Islam), I would have demolished the Ka'ba and would have rebuilt it on the foundation (laid) by Ibrahim) [Sahih Muslim], The foundations of the Ka'ba were not on the foundations that our prophet Ibrahim peace be upon him built. But the prophet here feared that if he did raze the Ka'ba and built it anew; the people would be conducive to the people committing apostasy. Because the Ka'ba was a very great thing to the Arabs even before Islam.
2. The head of hypocrisy 'Abdullah ibn Ubay ibn Salul said: If we return to Madina the honorable will expel the humiliated, this news reached 'Umar and he requested to kill him. The Prophet said, "Leave him, lest the people say Muhammad kills his companions:". [Sahih Bukhari, Sahih Muslim]

The prophet peace be upon him here considered the reaction of the people, thus this action was not carried out.

[21] Speech: This is what Allah and his messenger promised us, Al-Furqan Foundation, November 2016.
[22] Answering the questioner on the issue of calamities (2/4).

I will conclude these words with a point, and it is that the extremists usually use this hadith as proof: (And whoever seeks to please people by angering Allah, Allah will be angry with him and will cause people to be angry with him), to say that the jihadi groups do what displeases Allah! And completely forget that Allah Almighty says in the Quran: (And whoever kills a believer intentionally, his punishment is hell, he shall abide in it, and Allah will send His wrath on him and curse him and prepare for him a painful chastisement).

Thus the warning of killing believers – and this is what extremists do – is more severe than the warning present in the hadith! This if we really assume that the jihadi groups are seeking to please the people by displeasing Allah!

<u>Question:</u> Is sorcery used as a tool to torture those in prison?

<u>Answer:</u> Yes, sorcery or magic is used as a tool to torture prisoners, and these issues have been confirmed by the prisoners themselves. Like Waleed Muhammad AlHaj[23], Faris al-Zahrani (executed)[24], Hamad Al Hameedi (executed)[25], And 'Abd al-Aziz Altwaily (executed)[26].

In the year 2011 workshops were opened on the jihadi forums on how to cure sorcery or magic for the prisoners.

And this is a confirmed issue with many witnesses among the ex prisoners. It became from the self-evident issues, but to make the answer even clearer: Sorcery or magic is used as a tool to torture in soe countries, but not all.

Some might say: How can you suspect it is sorcery or magic? Can it not be that those countries gave their prisoners hallucination pills or pills that harm them mentally? The answer: This is reported, but you can distinguish between the two by reading Quran, the one afflicted by depression or took the mentally harmful pills will not interact with you when reading (Quran), unlike the person on whom sorcery has been done. As for the person afflicted by sorcery, by merely reading Quran he starts to yell and cry and throw up black stuff (because most sorcery is put in the food and drinks of the prisoners), and you notice that reading a lot will have a positive effect on him, and this does not happen to one who took hallucination pills or something like it.

In conclusion, we differentiate between the two situations by the reaction during reading Quran.

And curing it is in two issues:

- Either the prisoners read Quran on this ill person until his situation is better and he is treated.
- but if the prisoner was in an isolation cell; then he needs to memorize the Quran so he can treat himself. But if he did not memorize Quran, then that means his situation will become worse.

And through this issue you know the importance of memorizing Quran to the person if he falls in a calamity like this.

---

[23] The massacre of the Qal'a and the darkness of Guantanamo – Page 114,115.
[24] An aimed answer to the one who changes the religion of Muhammad – Page 298.
[25] The answer on the criminal court – Page 15.
[26] Oh Mujahideen..death and not disgrace – Page 4.

<u>Question:</u> Are you with the Taliban in their ban for womens' education?

<u>The answer:</u> I do not know whether the Taliban bans education for women in the areas they control or not, however, learning islamic knowledge is obligatory on men and women. Allah did not specify men for islamic education and excluded the women, and there are from the imams of Salaf whom educated women are were educated by women!

- Shaykh Ibn Kathir said in his "The beginning and the end": (The elderly pious woman Umm Zaynab Fatimah bint 'Abbas ibn Abi Fath, it was mentioned from her courtesy that she would attend the gatherings of Shaykh Al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, and would benefit from it, and I heard Shaykh ibn Taymiyyah eulogizing her and describing her with excellence and being knowledgeable, complimenting the good questions and her quickness in understanding)[27].

Imam Ibn al-Jawzī mentioned the names of his female shaykhs and teachers and from among them were:

1) Fatimah bint Abi Hakeem Al-Khubri.
2) Fatimah bint Muhammad Al-Bzaaz.
3) Shahdah Al-Ibriy. [28]

The mother of the believers Ayesha used to correct the mistakes (or tried to) of some of the Companions! Imam az-Zarkashī compiled a book on that subject (Al-Ijāba li-Īrād mā Istadrakathu 'Ā'isha 'alā al-Sahaba).

And the evidences in the history or contemporary times of our Ummah are uncountable in the issue of permissibility and desirability even the obligation teaching the women their religion, and no example of one who prevents the woman of learning, and preventing it is a mistake in any case.

[27] Al-Bidāya wa-n-nihāya "the beginning and the end" (18/ 140).
[28] Akhba' Al Dharafa' by Ibn al-Jawzi – Page 12.

<u>Question:</u> What is the verdict on The Free Syrian Army (FSA) and what is the ruling of the groups that fight with it against Islamic groups?

<u>The answer:</u> Firstly: There is no organization who are the free syrian army, Abu Muhammad al-Julani says:

(**Firstly we know the reality and as you know there is no such thing named free syrian army, it is a group of factions that concur under a name. None of them have organizational ties with the other, it is not an army and it is not an organization. It is just a slogan and a name with which the people went with**) [29].

There are a number of factions whom the media and others name Free Syrian Army, despite that these entities have other names.

And these entities or groups have no mutual ties or leadership or method. Rather they vary and differ between each other in orientation and presentation. For example: The Levant Front are FSA and they are a group tied to foreign (countries). And on the other hand Abu 'Umaarah battalion is also FSA and some describe them with extremism and harshness! And despite that their words in the media or others are labeled FSA!

If then, one faction of the FSA commited disbelief or involved in being agents, then this does not mean that all factions of the FSA committed these acts! And a religious verdict on one group of the FSA does not mean that this verdict is for the remaining factions named FSA!

We are facing systematic manipulation, the ignorance of the follower are exploited and his lack of being able to follow this up from the beginning. This because of his lacking in the Arabic language, in which he cannot see the discussions that happen between soldiers and commanders of the differing factions on the social media websites. Rather the translations made for him sufficed him. For sometimes even the official statements of the groups can see the shortfall or mistake or weakness present through the discussions that happen on the social media websites. For example one of the common stereotypes:

- A faction from the FSA say they want democracy! Thus the extremists say that the FSA (All of them) want a democratic state and they don't say that only one faction from the factions of the FSA want this! What you understand from their words is that ALL FSA factions want this.

- Then they fight the FSA (of those that do not want a democratic state) with Jabhat Nusra defending themselves against the attack of the Islamic State on them. You'll see the Islamic State say: Look, they are fighting with those who want a democratic state against us! The result: They committed disbelief because they support the apostates against the believers!

---

[29] Press conference, December 2015.

Therefor it is wrong for a person to formulate the question in this manner:" What is the verdict of fighting with the apostate FSA against the Islamic State", Because you decided the result that any faction called FSA is an apostate. And this is a wrong result because before this question is asked you should verify if the faction that fought with Jabhat Nusra or another faction is in fact an apostate.

Also a clear issue in your eyes does not mean it is a clear issue in the eyes of others, some terminologies are clear to you that they are of disbelief, but some use these terminologies because he does not understand its true meaning through which he means something else.

Even if he said it, he does not immediately commit disbelief, and you must determine from him what he means with this terminology, because it carries more than one meaning.

- The term (Civil State) means that the state is ruled by the civilians and not the army, some that say they want a civil state they mean this and do not mean the disbelieving meaning. Before you make a verdict you must determine that he means a civil state with the disbelieving meaning and not another meaning.

- Also the term democracy, some people think that democracy is the opposite of dictatorship, he then if he wants to express himself and say that he is not for dictatorship he says that he is a democrat!

Therefor the scholars and Shuyukh drew out that the one who that speaks words that carry more than one meaning then he does not commit disbelief except after they know the true meaning of what he said.

- Shar'i of Al-Qaeda in Iraq and the Islamic State in Iraq Abu Mariyah Al-Qurashi may Allah hasten his release said: (**Some gullible common people think that the word democracy is a synonym to justice and counsel, they do not mean with their words what the parliamentarians and politicians mean, these people are not to be declared disbelievers but it should be clarified to them. After that if they insist and resist after clarification, only after that you declare them disbelievers and its verdict**)[30].

- Shaykh Abū Muḥmmad al-Maqdisī says: (**The entity of democracy and parliament are new words and foreign terms, of which the true meaning is hidden from most people. Some people would do a certain job of which he does not know the true meaning, it is in the category of one who spoke words not knowing its meaning. The scholars adopt (the opinion) that he is not judged upon what he said until the true meaning is clarified. In our times some people do not know the meaning of the term democracy and its signification thus he compliments it thinking it only means – like most of the commoners – the opposite of**

[30] Summary of the words in the issues of names and rulings.

oppression, enslavement, confiscation of freedoms, rights, etc...This person is not declared a disbeliever until he knows it, in essence, means ruling of the people by the people or the rule of the majority and not the rule of Allah only...)[31].

- Shaykh Abu al-Walid al-Ansari said: (**Like most people, from among the general public and specific people, call to democracy not intending its meaning delivered at its inception which is the rule of people contradicting the rule of Allah Almighty. And did not offer Allahs' law to the opinions of people to be accepted or refused, rather he means freedom, justice, ensuring individual rights and so on of the meanings that oppose oppression and injustice in the islamic world. What is meant is that many people absolutely want these good meanings. But rather he expressed it by the mentioned word for its desirability on the tongs of the people and are proud of it. Or because of his ignorance to consider the abhorred meaning of the word. Or his ignorance of elaborating on the abhorred meaning of which contradicts the law (of Allah). Or ignorance of the fact that the law has come to indicate these good meanings. Even better, and the latter one refers to the shortcomings to make clear the advantages of Shari'a for the people, which is obligatory on the carrier of knowledge and preachers to Allah, to the believers**)[32].

Shaykh Naser Al-Fahd was asked: what is the ruling on saying: "Such and such is a democrat" or "I am a democrat" or "We want democracy" without knowing it's true meaning, rather thinking it means 'Shura' even if he was able to ask and seek information about it?

He answered:

(- If with his words he meant 'Shura' then he did not commit disbelief with his words; but the word is detested, so it is upon him to leave these words to the undeceiving shar'i words.

- If he knows that it means that the people rule and he intended that meaning, then this is kufr.

- And if he knows the meaning but did not intend the meaning, but he intended with it 'Shura', then he does not commit disbelief. But the word is detested and Allah is All Knowing). [33]

Conclusion:

- The term civil nation has more than one meaning.
- The term democracy is used in contrary to its real meaning because of their ignorance to it.

31 Risaala Ath-Thalaatheeniya, Page 336.
32 The Levant message – Page 3.
33 Fatawas from Al Hayer (Prison), page 38.

- Declaring them disbelievers, the one who uses these words without knowing the intention of the one who says these words, is not correct.

The disasters done by the extremists are:

- Declaring disbelievers those who use these terms without knowing what he means or wants.
- Even if a faction meant the disbelief meaning, they declare them all (disbelievers) because of the faults of some. The entire FSA are then disbelievers and apostates because some factions of what is called the FSA fell in disbelief!!!
- Based on the declaring all of them disbelievers then anyone who fights with a faction from the FSA even if he did not want a democratic or civil disbelieving nation , this faction are disbelievers as well because they support the apostates against the believers!!!

And so the chain of extremism continues in declaring disbelief and distribution of warrants of disbelief on the rest! Only so it is confirmed on the outside (other countries) that they are the only ones on the truth!!! Taking advantage of those who are ignorant or lack in the arabic language on the outside to be able to distinguish right from wrong.

To conclude I don't say that the FSA is clean, rather most of the FSA factions have sins. But in return I say that not all the factions of the FSA are disbelievers!

<u>Question:</u> What is the reality regarding Jabhatun Nusrah breaking their ties with Al Qaida? (This is a question asked by researchers such as Tore Hamming, Cole Bunzel with different wordings)

<u>The answer:</u> I will summarise the reply by the following points:

- Communication with Dr. Ayman al-Zawāhirī was not possible due to security issues (as mentioned by Abu Maria al-Qahtani in the interview with the news site "Arabic 21")

- The branch of Al-Qaida in Shaam which is Jabhatun Nusrah wants to take immediate decision regarding breaking of its ties with Al Qaida for the sake of uniting with the rest of the other groups because this was the condition laid down by them as they do not want to unite with Al Qaida. This is so that this unity does not become an excuse for targeting them by claiming to target Al-Qaida.

- They turned towards Abu Al-Khayr who is according to Jabhatun Nusrah the general deputy of Sheikh Ayman al-Zhawāhirī...!!! He approved this step and endeavoured from his part and paved the way for them to announce their split from Al Qaida in an official statement which was released by Al Manaratul Baydaa Foundation which is the media wing of Jabhatun Nusrah.

- After the split from Al Qaida took place, there occurred communication with Zawahiri and he very strongly refused this step (and this is the reality of what al-Maqdisī said in his reply to Abu Abdullah Shaami since I asked him)

- The disagreement which took place is as follows: Does Abu Al-Khayr have the authority as a deputy to break ties with the branches of Al Qaida without referring to the topmost leader?

- Jabhat Fateh Al-Shaam says that even if he does not have the authority for it, returning back to Al Qaida has become an impossible matter by them having merged with the other groups.

- So for example you see that Al Qaida's top leadership praised the merger of the factions in Mali in an official statement whereas it did not praise the merger in Shaam.

- The majority of the Jihadis consider Joulani and those with him to have acted wrongly but despite that they still rejoice over the victories of Hay'at Tahreer Al- Shaam and they pray for them.

- The condition for splitting from Al Qaida in an official manner is when a government or an Islamic state in Shaam gets established. And this has been mentioned by Dr. Ayman al-Zhawāhirī in his statement entitled "Faith defeats arrogance" in the year 2013. And there is a huge difference between establishing a government and establishing a Jihadi entity.

- Jabhat Fateh Shaam says that a lot of the allegations made against them by their opponents regarding how they split from Al Qaida are not true. And they issued in their territories an almost 60 pages booklet explaining their viewpoint regarding what took place. This booklet has not yet been uploaded to the internet.

- Conclusion: The dispute between Al Qaida and Hay'at Tahreer Al-Shaam should be regarded as "organisational dispute" till this moment and not as "methodological dispute".

<u>Question:</u> Why did the presence of the Chechen issue in particular or the Caucasus issue in general as a whole weaken in the Arab and Islamic world?

<u>The answer:</u> Firstly, without a doubt, the Chechen issue (which is main part of the issue of the North Caucasus in general) was one of the well known issues in the Islamic world which the old and the young sympathized with, the Islamist and the commoner, but as time went on the news that came from the area was less looked into. **<u>Then for a specific time news stopped coming from there</u>**, and after a long time it returned in a way which perhaps would not bring the person deeper into the events, but would make the person know what is happening in a general form, and he would not know what is happening in detail or have the latest updates. But why did the mention of the Caucasus or Chechen issue in specific decrease?!

There are many reasons that made the Chechen issue out of the minds of the Arab world, until it returned a second time to the forefront, but not like how it was previously, but rather the main followers of this issue became Jihadis only and not like how it was before when large parts of the Arab community followed and sympathized with. But we will summarize the reasons as follows:

- Increasing number of Jihad fronts: When the Chechen issue reached its peak, and this was in the mid nineties, there were no notable issues except the Bosnian and Chechen issues. And both the issues were related to Russia or the allies of Russia, the Slavs. And since the Arab Gulf states, which were originally a center of influence over the rest of the Arab and Islamic nations, when they became directly tied to the fulfillment of the American interests, there was no difficulty in overlooking or supporting these fronts because they were not against the Americans. But the problem that happened after the 9/11 attacks opened the battle front in Afghanistan and turned away all the sights towards it. Then after two years the American war on Iraq happened. And then the Americans put all the Jihadi groups in one basket, be it Al-Qaeda or otherwise, even those who oppose it, which led to the supporters and the sponsors of the Chechen issue in the Arab countries to abstain from or fear to continue their support so they may not be linked to terrorism. Many distanced themselves from supporting the Mujahideen so that they may not be arrested or be put under difficulty and pressure. And the increase in front-lines and their proximity to the gulf countries (like Iraq for example) took priority in being followed up and supported etc... And with the increase in battlefronts like Afghanistan, Iraq, Somalia, Mali and the Arab Spring countries, it made the Chechen issue at the end of the ranking order.

- The discontinuity of communications: The most notable problem that faced the Chechen issue was the discontinuity of communication and relaying of news. Previously there was a media committee that relayed the news in Arabic and also audio and video publications were spread in Arabic like the series (The Russian Inferno), and the Arab Mujahideen used to publish their Arabic books from inside Chechnya whether be it internal instructions or external, like the books of Shaykh Abu ‘Umar Al-Sayf or the audio recordings of the commander Khattab, or the letters of Abu Al Waleed Al-Ghamidi and likewise the book (The Carnage of Chechnya), as the people usually do not react except when the media addresses them in their own language. But with the rampant increase in the killing of the Arab Mujahideen who were relaying the voice of

the Chechen issue to the Arab speakers and then with killing of the Caucasian Mujahideen who spoke Arabic, the elements that spoke Arabic decreased significantly. And through this, you can know the importance of preserving the people who speak more than one language in the ranks of the Mujahideen,[34] and that they must not be put in the front lines, rather they should be preserved, "because sometimes words are deadlier than bullets!"

- The Russians took control of the most important areas which were under control of the Mujahideen. So they took refuge in the forests and the isolated areas. And that broke the morale significantly of those who did not believe in the long road, and that war is a struggle with its ups and downs, and thus he would abandon the cause because he saw it as a lost cause. When you tell him why did you stop following up on the issue, he would say: Is there actually even a Jihad?! Do you not see that the Russians took over the major cities?! The issue has ended! [35]

- The disputes that happened between the Caucasus Mujahideen themselves: When disputes happen and become fierce between the parties and voices in it are raised, the sympathetic observer is often frustrated because he will have to determine his position between the conflicting parties, either be with the first or the second. However he will say "I am not sympathizing so that I stand with you against each other, rather I stand against the disbelieving enemy", and thus the sympathizer will retreat.

- The Russian strategy in Chechnya itself, by appointing the apostate Ramzan Kadyrov as the ruler of the Chechen republic. Instead of the fight becoming clear against the occupying invaders, the fight turned to be against the sons of their nation, "**Even if the latter are worse in Kufr due to being apostates, however the former are clearer in their Kufr**". [36] The people usually delay joining armed disputes between Muslims against other (apparent) Muslims fearing being involved in the spilling of impermissible blood. And from this you can know the danger of the apostate who sold his religion in the Caucasus issue.

---

[34] If sometimes when you do not find any person who is proficient in the Arabic language in your group, then here the intermediate language plays a role, because then you can give your message through this intermediate language. The Arabs, a lot of them usually know English because it's a language taught in schools and required for the person to know before he can start working in government jobs or particular industries. So when an Arab finds a material in a language that, even though it is true that it is not his mother tongue, but he still understands it, and if he was sympathetic and a supporter to Jihad and the Mujahideen then he will translate it into the Arabic language, and through that it will reach the Arabs who do not know English. I will give you an example regarding the importance of an intermediate language. My book *"Methodological Difference Between ISIS and Al-Qaeda: Who are the ones that deviated?"* was published in the Arabic language and was not translated into a single language! But when it was published in English it was translated into almost nine different languages. So sometimes you need an intermediate language which is understood by the people who speak multiple languages so as to send your message.

[35] Perhaps the issue became worse when the portion with the majority of the Mujahideen in the Caucasus Emirate pledged allegiance to ISIS, and after that ISIS asked them to leave the areas under their control to come to fight in Syria. And with that the forests and the isolated areas got completely emptied, as if the weather finally became clear for the Russians to enter the areas which they previously used to fear entering in the past several long years due to the orders given by this organization!

[36] This is the strategy of Al-Qaeda and the reason for giving priority to fighting the Kaafir west above fighting the apostate governments. Refer: Complete collection of letters and directions by Shaykh Usamah ibn Laden – Page 785.

- The joining of the greater part of the Mujahideen of the Caucasus Emirate with ISIS. This organization is hated and its image is distorted with most Muslims in the Arab countries. Thus any support to those Mujahideen or sympathizing with them or with their case means that you sympathize with the Islamic State, and the people here hate this organization and do not want to support them in any way or other, not even by showing sympathy, as if the Caucasus issue has got tainted by some organization! And through that you can know the importance of having a competing source that could be an alternative outlet for the supporters, so that neither the people, nor the scholars, nor the relief organizations may find discomfort in supporting them or to communicate with them or to strive to spread their issue amongst the common Muslims. When the Iraqi issue was tainted by being turned into an issue of ISIS due to them being the only group available there that fights the Shiites, the relief organizations and many scholars and many people could not support Iraq. Some do this fearing being tied to ISIS and others say why would I support an organization which blew up my town and killed my family? If I support it and they endure then I will be next and they will come to me! (This is the mentality of some people regardless of its truth, but I relayed it so that you may see the picture in a broader light). Therefore it is important to break the monopoly that this organization has over the fronts of Jihad, so that the issue does not end up in failure.

Perhaps these reasons muffled the sound of media regarding the Chechen or Caucasus issue, and these reasons are also present in the non-Arabic Islamic issues. Therefore if you review the archives of Jihadi statements which are not in the Arabic language, be it in Central Asia or South East Asia or the Caucasus, you will see that often their statements in Arabic are very few! And you will find that this is the problem. Most of us do not know these groups and what their methodology is and what their causes are, which makes the person observing from afar to take a passive stance as he would not want to support a group whose methodology might be Kufr and contradict the basic doctrines of his faith..! Or he would not want to involve himself in an issue that does not concern him, like how most people (among them the leader Khattab) thought about the Chechen issue that it was a dispute between Chechen communists and the Russians...! [37] That is why most did not react to the Chechen issue in the beginning because it was not clear. And hence the other issues must be made clear through the following points:

- Clarification of the issue and who are the parties to it
- Clarification of the Manhaj (methodology) of the group that fights
- And updates regarding the last news and developments

Through these three points your issue will go out from a local frame to an Islamic frame, and it will make the Muslims sympathize and follow up with you. And with that the people will rush to you from all sides of the world with different languages, colors and nationalities, and you can

[37] The commander Khattab says: (The events in Chechnya happened and the reality is that we did not think it was an Islamic issue, and we used to watch television and watch the issue and say that the one leading these events (Dzhokhar Dudayev) is a communist general. And that they are communists inside Russia and that these are problems between them! This was the idea we had, and we did not look at the issue in the beginning as an Islamic issue). [The experience of the Arab Ansar in Chechnya – Page 13]

employ and later use them to spread your message in their language to their people to widen the area of sympathy and increase the Muslim followers.

Question: Is there any relation of cooperation between Al-Qaeda organization and Iran, or has Iran started to use Al-Qaeda for its own benefit?

The answer: Without a doubt there is a propaganda around this topic. You could say that the hostile parties, either to Iran or to Al-Qaeda usually play on a string that there is united cooperation. Because this claim harms both parties! The hostile parties benefit in both cases. If Al-Qaeda then did not respond it will harm their credibility. And if Al-Qaeda responded militarily and appeared publicly in Iran as well this would harm their interests. This claim is like a blade in your mouth, if you pull it out you wound yourself and if you swallow it you wound yourself as well.

But if we look at the arguments of the claimers on our own, they rely on two things to affirm the existence of a cooperative amiable relation between Al-Qaeda and Iran, and these arguments are:

1) Why are there Al-Qaeda leaders in Iran?
2) Why doesn't Al-Qaeda operate militarily in Iran?!

As for the first point, we know that after the U.S war on Afghanistan, many of the leadership, soldiers and families left Afghanistan because it became dangerous for them. "And in the period in which the brothers left Afghanistan shortly after the U.S. war on Afghanistan began, and after they then entered Iran, some brothers were caught by the Iranian intelligence, and they put them under house arrest".[38]

So the first point we must know is that: That the presence of them in Iran was in the form of imprisonment and detention and not political asylum or a free presence.

Secondly: The presence of some leadership figures of Al-Qaeda in Iran was in secrecy and concealment. Sometimes you could be in a country while the authorities of that country do not know that you are present there. And the most noteworthy of those who entered and hid in Iran for a time was Abū Muṣʽab al-Zarqāwī. He appeared in a documentary published by the group Ansar Al-Islam in Iraq "**After the U.S. assault on Afghanistan, small groups of Arab Mujahideen retreated towards Iran. And some groups settled secretly in Tehran, among them the group of Abu Abū Muṣʽab al-Zarqāwī. And the leadership saw that it was their duty to help them**". [39]

And likewise Shaykh Atiyyatullah al-Lībī, he said: "**We in Iran, who sheltered us? The brothers after they left to Iran after the retreat from here, who sheltered them? The Tabligh Jama'ah sheltered them in Zahidaan in the region of Baluchistan. 'Abd Al-Hameed and his group sheltered us and supported us and stood with us. And their stance with us was a very very noble and honorable stance. And they were subjected to prisons and some of them were put to death and so on**." [40]

[38] From the article "The proposed Jihadi position on the events of Lebanon", released by "Voice of Jihad", the media branch of Al-Qaeda in the land of the two Holy mosques.

[39] Scenes from the history of the first Jihadi banner of empowerment and the Emirate in Iraq – Page 75.

[40] Complete collection of the works of Shaykh Atiyyatullah al-Lībī – Page 1638.

Either you would be detained or imprisoned or in hiding and a fugitive in Iran! As for the one who protects you and guarantees your protection and residence, his fate from the Iranian government is either prison or death!

We return to the first point which is - imprisonment or house arrest. Al-Qaeda did not say that the leaders and families staying in Iran is a good thing because the Iranians are our helpers and we trust them! Rather they said that this is a problem which needs to be solved even if it be by using force to get the families out of Iran, and that the Iranian government is absolutely not to be trusted.

And the detention process witnessed matters such as:

1) Medical neglect that led to death. The general official of Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan, Shaykh Mustafa Abu Al-Yazeed says: "**The Iranians imprisoned and are still imprisoning the Mujahideen who left Afghanistan even with their families and children, and until now there are many Mujahideen inside the Iranian prisons. Amongst them is Shaykh Muhammad Islambuli who is still in the Iranian prisons, and in fact, there has reached us clear and certain news or information that his wife has died inside the prison in Iran due to negligence in her treatment. Likewise some children died because of this reason. The issue even reached the point that they beat the Mujahideen and humiliate them, even Shaykh Muhammad Al-Islambuli himself. They themselves glorified Khalid Al-Islambuli and named a street in Tehran with his name. But now this is how they treat his brother Muhammad Al-Islambuli. We ask Allah to free him and return him safely and successfully and as a Mujahid for Allah Almighty's sake. There is no relation between us and them (Iran) and we are not pleased with them, rather between us and them is hostility due to how they treat the Sunnis, and there is no agreement or any mutual benefit between us and them. There is no reason for not conducting operations against them except that we are waiting for the appropriate circumstances and the appropriate times, by the will of Allah**". [41]

2) Handing over a number of prisoners to their respective countries. Shaykh Abu Baseer al-Wuhayshi, a leader in Al-Qaeda in The Arabian Peninsula said: "**After we retreated from Tora Bora in 2002, after that there were security issues. We left Afghanistan and went to Iran, to the Sunnis in Iran in the Sunni areas in Iran. After that I was imprisoned in Iran and I stayed in prison approximately a month and a half. The Yemeni government came with an agreement with the Rafidha, and they returned me to Yemen chained in metal**". [42]

3) Beatings, torture, quelling. Khalid Usamah ibn Laden, in a letter published on Jihadi websites, to the supreme director Ali Khamenei said: "**You have heard the words of my two brothers, Abdur-Rahman and Umar about the imprisonment of some of my family members in Iran as well as their demand to release them. Now I, as well, third their demand and reconfirm their presence in Iran. After the Crusader attack on Afghanistan which centered around targeting specifically the Arab families amongst others, especially at its onset, they were forced to enter Iran through unofficial means, and most of those who did were women and children.**

[41] Press conference with Al-Jazeera correspondent Ahmad Zaydan, published on Al Jazeera channel in the program (Liqaa Al-Yawn) dated 23 June 2009.

[42] Press conference with 'Abd Al-Ilah Shayi' - Page 22, published by: Al-Malahem Foundation.

One year after their arrival in Iran, the Iranian intelligence rounded them up. When we heard of this, we wrote to the Iranian government a number of times and even used scholars and other influential people to mediate their release, promising that they would never return to Iran, but all these efforts were of no use. Finally, my sister Imaan was able to flee from detention and sought refuge in the Riyadh Embassy in Tehran a few weeks ago. After my two brothers were able to confirm her presence in the embassy, I was surprised that the foreign minister had not known her identity, stating that he had no idea how she entered Iran and how she arrived at the embassy. He had also previously stated that there were no members of my family present in Iran, despite the fact that they have been in custody there for several years. This is a difficult matter to understand. If the minister had referred to the case of my two brothers with the intelligence, he would have known the details of this sad story, and he would have come to know that my brother Sa'd had also escaped, alone, and informed us of the true story: that they had requested a number of times to leave Iran, only to be beaten and silenced. If only the intelligent and just had looked into the what he told us of the tragedy and hardships experienced by our families in the prisons and detention centers, which in turn led to the spread of emotional and psychological disorders amongst the women and children, they would without doubt initiate efforts to release them as soon as possible to relieve this great suffering. Was their only sin that they emigrated in Allah's Cause seeking His pleasure? Wasn't their weakness, the pursuit of international forces of infidelity after them, and their being foreigners in a strange land away from their homes and families enough?" [43]

<u>How was this problem then solved?!</u>

Al-Qaeda captured an Iranian consul in Pakistan in the year 2007 and at the end of year 2010. The agreement took place regarding the release of some family members and leadership in Iran in exchange for this consul. Shaykh Atiyyatullah Al-Libbi mentioned some of the names of those who were freed and then said: "**And we think that our efforts which included political and media "verbal" escalation, and the threat which we sent to them, and the capture of their associate, the trade deputy in the consulate in Peshawar; and other things they saw from us, and brought fear to them, could be one of the reasons for the speedy process from them. But they, the criminals, did not send any message to us, and they did not talk to any of the brothers about it (ie. about releasing the brothers). Of course, this is nothing strange coming from them; in fact, this is their mentality and their method. They don‟t want to show that they are negotiating with us or reacting to our pressure, they just do these acts to appear as if it is one-sided and as a matter of initiative from their part. We ask God to repel their evil… Ameen**". [44]

And after that Al-Qaeda captured another Iranian consul in Yemen year 2013. Regarding that Shaykh Ayman al-Zawāhirī in a letter sent specifically to Abu Suhayb, a leader in ISIS, said: "**Before we wade into the subject of the letter, I have another issue of utmost importance, and I request your complete dedication to it, which is that our brothers in Yemen were able – by Allah's grace – to capture an Iranian. We request from you to send us a list of names of**

[43] Message from Khalid Bin Usama Bin Laden regarding the imprisonment of some family members in Iran, dated: 1st January 2010, by Global Islamic Media Front.

[44] Complete collection of the works of Shaykh Atiyyatullah al-Lībī – Page 1828

imprisoned sisters, from them our sister Hasna, the widow of Shaykh Abu Hamza Al Muhajir may Allah have mercy on him. And also the names of brothers sentenced to death in Iraq. So we can include them in our negotiations if they happen by Allah's will". [45]

And even after the release of the families in the first deal, Al-Qaeda did not have a bit of trust in Iran. Shaykh Usamah ibn Laden for example said regarding the release of them from Iran: "**They also should be warned on the importance of getting rid of everything they received from Iran, like baggage or anything, even as small as a needle, as there are eavesdropping chips that are developed to be so small that they can even be put inside a medical syringe; and since the Iranians are not to be trusted, then it is possible to plant chips in some of the belongings of the people who are coming**". [46]

In light of all this, we have the right to ask: If there was mutual understanding, and relation based on cooperation, and amiability between Iran and Al-Qaeda, would Al-Qaeda then need to imprison Iranian diplomats?

And if the presence of families and leadership in Iran was pleasing and under agreement with Iran and Al-Qaeda, then why did Al-Qaeda insist in removing them from Iran even if it be by using force and kidnapping operations??!

I think that these two questions will inform you of the reality of the relation between Iran and Al-Qaeda, which in summary is:

1. Detainment and imprisonment.
2. Humiliation, torture, beatings and medical neglect of detainees
3. Surrendering a number of prisoners to their respective countries to make them suffer more and be under U.S. interrogation and supervision.
4. Imprisonment and killing by the Iranian government, those who give shelter to the Mujahideen of Al-Qaeda in Iran.
5. Kidnapping operations and exchange between Al-Qaeda and Iran.
6. Absence of trust.

Is it logical to describe one whose relation with the other party is in this manner, as an ally to them?

And now the second point as to why does Al-Qaeda not attack Iran?!

There are almost three points of view:

1) The existence of Iran represents a supply line to Al-Qaeda whether financially or in manpower.[47] Everyone that entered and joined Al-Qaeda after the U.S. war on Afghanistan entered through the Iranian borders. If Iran had tightened its security to a certain level, then

---

[45] Letter to Abu Suhayb, page 1.

[46] Complete collection of letters and directions by Shaykh Usamah ibn Laden – Page 801

[47] Abū Muḥammad al 'Adnānī says: "The Islamic State follows the advice and directions of the scholars of Jihad and its symbols, and because of that the Islamic State did not strike the Rawafidh in Iran since its beginning, leaving the Rawafidh to enjoy security and safety by obeying the order of Al-Qaeda, to protect their interests and their supply lines in Iran". Statement "Apologies Oh commander of Al-Qaeda", Al-Furqan foundation, May 2014

after armed operations and public emergence of Al-Qaeda, this security level will be heightened further and they will carry out campaigns which in the end will lead to cutting the vein of supply, and then the organization will become besieged. And without supplies the organization will be paralyzed. Wealth and men are the nerve of the organization, and war burns men and wealth like fire burns fuel. I think that Al-Qaeda had two choices, either to preserve its continuity in its work and ignore Iran in this stage or to start armed operations against Iran and then stand unable to do any action.

2) Al-Qaeda leadership, especially those in the first row, for example: Sayf Al'Adl and Abu Muhammad Al-Masri and Sulaiman Abu Ghaith and others were present in Iran. Al-Qaeda was afraid that any reaction in the end would lead to killing or execution of those as a reaction to armed operations. Therefore Ayman Al-Zawāhirī said to Abū Muṣʿab al-Zarqāwī: "**And do the brothers forget we have more than a 100 imprisoned brothers – most of them from the leadership whom are wanted in their countries – with the Iranians? Even if we attack the Shiites out of necessity, why then announcing it in this way and show it which forces the Iranians to take a counter stance**?" [48]

3) Iran represented a country of refuge to many Afghans. Mullah Umar ordered the groups to stop attacking Iran because of this out of caution against any retaliation, which would increase the bad humanitarian situation to worse for the Afghans in Iran. (And this was mentioned by the Aljazeera journalist Ahmad Mawfiq Zaydan but I do not remember where, in an interview or television report or in his book: Taliban Afghanistan...future of the movement and prospects of a nation).

But on the other hand -

Al-Qaeda did not remain as a mere spectator watching the Iranian incursions or projects spreading in the Arab regions. And I will not enumerate the number of operations of all its branches which were carried out against the allies of Iran and their puppets, which could have reached tens of thousands of operations.

I will mention the most notable ones:

1. In Iraq, Al-Qaeda under the leadership of Abū Muṣʿab al-Zarqāwī targeted the most notable agents of Iran who were raised on their laps like Ezzedine Saleem and Mohammad Baaqir al-Hakim.
2. In Yemen, Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula claimed the assassination of Badr Al-Deen Al-Houthi, who is the spiritual leader of the Houthis.
3. In Syria, Jabhat Nusra, the Al-Qaeda branch in Syria then, assassinated Iranian generals and commanders.

If there was a relation of subordination between Al-Qaeda and Iran, like how some people claim, then the following things would have happened:

[48] Letter to Abu Mus'ab Al-Zarqawi – Page 13.

1. Al-Qaeda would be like Hizbullah, an Iranian card used in the regional battles in service to the Iranian interests. And thus Al-Qaeda would fight anyone that fights or targets Iran or its allies and would leave targeting Iran and its allies in the Arab regions.
2. Or in the worst case they would take the stance of a neutral spectator, who does not want to determine his stance, so that he does not anger the two parties who are fighting each other!

But why don't we say that the following groups in reality are cooperating with Iran:

1. The U.S. government who only targets those who fight Iranians and their allies in Syria and Iraq, and does not target the Iranians and their allies, and when the bombing in Deir AlZor happened by mistake the Americans apologized for bombing them!
2. The Hamas movement who till this day is still giving condolences for the killed ones of the Lebanese Hizbullah in Syria like Sameer Al-Qantar and Mustafa Badr Al-Din. They were killed in Syrian territories in a mission to kill Syrian Sunnis!
3. The governments of the gulf countries which support the government of Abbadi in its war against the Ahlu Sunnah in Iraq, while the government of Abbadi is merely a government that is subordinate to Iran. The Abbadi government does not kill terrorists – like it claims – rather they kill all Sunnis. Most of the violations that happened and the forced imprisonment according to the witnesses from international human rights groups, happened to Sunni civilians.

Question: Does not every faction that takes support or backing from a government mean that it is subordinate to this government and is therefore a Kaafir?

The answer: No, receiving backing or support from a specific government is not a proof that the faction taking it is subordinate to them. This is because subordination is something more than just taking money or support. It is commitment and total submission to the supporting government for matters that take one outside the fold of Islam, in which this faction becomes like an army corps to the supporting state. They cannot make a decision or implement an order except by the orders issued by the supporting state.

Thus you will know that not all support from one party means being an agent or subordinate to this party.

Because if we merely say taking support means being an agent, this then would mean that Shaykh ‘Abdullah ‘Azzam was an agent! He used to take support from governments and used to go to different countries and gather donations and was facilitated and supported by these governments themselves. Was the Shaykh then an agent?! The answer is: Absolutely not.

Hence we must differentiate between taking support from a government and being subordinate to the supporting government.

Depending on the supporting government and on the subordination of the receiving faction to it in an issue that is Kufr, you can know the verdict on this faction!

Meaning that even if the supporting government was an apostate government or a Kaafir Asli government (that was never previously upon Islam), and it made the faction to be subordinate to it in a matter that is Kufr (like forcing them to raise the slogans of a democratic state with the Kufr meaning and to fight anyone that wants Sharia), then we can say that both conditions have been applied on this faction and thus this faction is an agent and an apostate.

What are these conditions?

- A Kaafir government
- Submitting to it in a issue that is Kufr

And my statement "it made the faction to be subordinate to it for a matter that is Kufr" is to exclude the other issues which are not Kufr, like a Muslim joining a Kaafir army but with the intention to fight another Kaafir army. Here the Muslim does not become a Kaafir because these issues are differed upon by the scholars due to their Ijtihad.[49] Hence I said that there has

---

[49] Shaykh Sulaymān Al-'Ulwān has a long verdict on this section titled: 'What is the verdict on giving support to a Muslim state that is ruled by a Kaafir against another hostile Kaafir state?'. In it is stated: "I will go even further on this; there is no blame for supporting a Kaafir state and Kaafir people against another Kaafir state, if there is a benefit for Islam and the Muslims in it'.

Shaykh Ali Al Khudayr also said: "Like how if a state attacks another state whose people in it are Muslims and their ruler is a Kaafir, and this ruler announced Jihad against the attacker, here there is no problem in doing Jihad along side this ruler against the attacker". [Az-Zinaad Fil Sharh Lum'at Al-I'tiqaad Li Ibn Qudama – Page 64].

These verdicts of both the scholars were before the U.S. war on Iraq and when the Iraqi army was the only force defending Iraq, but if there were other factions present like a Jihadi groups then, it is impermissible without a doubt to

to be subordination to the Kaafir for an issue of Kufr like fighting against the Muslims or adopting Kufr principles.

Now some factions may get supported by the apostate governments and so one might say: These governments do not give support for the sake of Allah and they are not charity organizations, rather they are giving support so as to use them to achieve their goals of not letting an Islamic State be established etc. We then say: The rulings of Takfeer are not based on end results. Thus you can't say "This faction is Kaafir because they will commit Kufr in the future", because this a reasoning which contradicts the rules for issuing Hukm (verdicts). But when the faction is being used for a matter that removes one from Islam, only then can you apply on them the judgment of becoming Kaafir and agent. But before that you can't do anything except warn.

Shaykh Abū Qatāda al-Filisṭīnī in an old speech about the MOC factions says: "The MOC is an operations room in South Jordan by the Americans, Jordans, Saudis and Emiratis".

A brother might say: "**Yes the governments aren't charity organizations. The end result of the agreements of the MOC is that these governments will have control over these factions and they will use them to fight the groups that are hostile to these countries". These are issues that are linked to end results, and we should not judge on a man based on the end results.**

We discourage, we alert, we point out, we lay down landmarks, and we warn, but to issue a verdict based on the end results, then this is wrong, especially when related to Takfeer (declaring one to be a Kaafir).

And I want to say and repeat, that the issue on which the MOC operations room has gathered upon is not an issue which takes you out of the fold of Islam, rather it is an issue related to the support from these countries for these factions, or groups called as the MOC operations room for military operations. And therefore this action alone – and we are talking about jurisprudence here – there is nothing wrong with it. We, after that we say that these groups become prisoners in the hands of these countries. These groups carry out the programs of these countries in fighting the Mujahid groups, and thus these groups become agents".[50]

The scholars of Jihad did not at all forbid dealing or taking support from external party, rather they gave these issues some regulations, and they did not judge the case by giving it only one verdict.

---

fight alongside a Kaafir against a Kaafir. But the purpose of relaying these verdicts is that fighting alongside a Kaafir against a Kaafir is not an issue that takes you out of the fold of Islam.

In the book of Shaykh Abū Qatāda 'Ju'nat Al-Mutayyibeen' in which Sheikh Abū Muḥmmad al-Maqdisī wrote a foreword, he narrated the sayings of the Imams of the Salaf on the issue of fighting under the banner of a Mushrik against another Mushrik for the sake of religious interests, and then he said: "And with this it will become evident for you that the issue of a Muslim fighting under the banner of the Mushrik, to achieve benefits for Islam, are secondary issues based on Ijtihad in which the view points of the Imams differed. The one who differs is not to be declared as astray nor made Takfeer upon. Note that this is not intended to demonstrate that one opinion outweighs the other, but it is rather to refute those making Takfeer on the one who follows any of the two opinions like how those deluded ones do".

[50] 'Bughyat al Aamil Fee Jam' al Maqaalaat Wal Masaail' (2/118)

On this Shaykh Abū Muṣʿab Al-Suri said: "**The issue of taking support from external parties is like all issues, which should be put under inquiry as to whether they are 'permissible or impermissible, beneficial or harmful, possible or impossible'. This varies according every different fund**".[51]

Shaykh Abū Qatāda al-Filisṭīnī says "**I say and advise to not take funds (from external governments), and if you take it, do not take it with conditions, and do not make it a pillar of support for you in your Jihad so that you do not reach a stage where you are not independent by being subordinate to the funds that come to you from outside**".[52]

The Shaykh here says there is no issue in taking funds under two conditions:

- That you do not accept the funding party putting conditions on you.
- That you not make these funds the foundation for your group, meaning do not draft the budget of the group based on external fund, but put it in projects which if this external fund was cut at any time, it will not harm the group. And it is preferred that the external funds be used for investment projects and for endowments that increase the sources of income for the group. [53]

At an organizational level, the organisation of Al-Qaeda believes in the permissibility of taking support from some apostate governments if certain conditions are fulfilled.

Shaykh Abū Yaḥyā al-Lībī says: "**Sheikh Abu Al-Layth Al-Libi told me – may Allah have mercy on him – that he contacted some contemporary lofty scholars, who are now imprisoned by the Aal-Saud oppressors and whose names I cannot mention [he means Sheikh Sulaymān Al-'Ulwān],[54] and he asked him about the verdict of taking support from some apostate governments' apparatus for certain partial cases, and he permitted it for him under three conditions:**

Firstly, that you be safe from their betrayal, or that you be alert of it so that in case there was any betrayal it will not affect you.

Secondly: The benefit is greater than the harms.

Thirdly: That it ends when the benefits for you end".

What is intended by the third condition is that taking support should end as soon as the interests which required taking this support also come to an end. It means that the issue of

---

51 Explanation of the book "The War of the Flea: The Classic Study of Guerrilla Warfare" By Robert Taber – Page 832.

52 Second interview with Ghurfat Tareeq al Haq – Page 9.

53 Abu Mus'ab Suri says "There is wealth that you can take if you laid down a plan to not depend on them so that they do not become a dagger that is used to stab you from behind. This wealth may be taken and invested. And they are not to be used and nor should actions be founded based on that. If actions are founded based on that then you will be afflicted with death. You have 100 soldiers and you spend 10 dollars for each soldier, and then a hundred thousand dollar came to you, and you said "I want to increase the number of soldiers to 2000". So the one who gives you the fund will know that you are in need, and of course you will not be able to feed (the 2000 soldiers) on your own except through the funder". [Explanation of the book "The War of the Flea: The Classic Study of Guerrilla Warfare" By Robert Taber – Page 832]

54 Sheikh Abū Yaḥyā al-Lībī in his letter to Al-Qaeda in Islamic Maghreb says regarding this Fatwa "The scholar who Sheikh Abu Layth Al-Libbi - may Allah have mercy on him - sought verdict from was Sheikh Sulaymān Al-'Ulwān, may Allah cause him to be released". [Letters to the Islamic Maghreb, page 55]

mutual dealings and taking support should not be left completely open. But each particular case should be considered and studied along with the interests and harms that are linked to it. And even based on this statement, taking support from them should be for temporary partial cases that do not go beyond the need. As for some Islamic groups being completely devoted to the intelligence agencies of some apostate governments, and the groups throwing themselves on to their laps and relying on them completely such that it gets solidified in the minds of the commanders and their followers that it is impossible to advance or retreat without them - this cannot be considered as taking support no matter what those taking it claim by classifying it as being under necessity, let alone when not a necessity but a mere benefit. Such actions as these are what lead to becoming agents and towards treachery, and towards distortion of the path of Jihad, and losing its fruits. The harms that arise due to these dealings are grave and dangerous, and it ends with one abandoning his principles".[55]

On the other hand, you also have the factions that did not submit to their supporter. Like the Nūr ad-Dīn az-Zankī Movement despite their mistakes, they however did not submit to the funding party like the rest of the groups did during the issue of the merger. They decided to merge opposing the rest of the groups who obeyed the orders of their funder to not join this merger with Hay'at Tahrir al-Sham. From this you know that there are examples of taking external funds without agreeing to completely submit to the funding party, rather they rebel against them!

And I say: That taking support from Kaafir or apostate governments is like a man isolating himself alone with a beautiful woman. It is true that merely being alone with a woman does not mean that he has committed adultery with her, but you must warn him from this action, which can get repeated and increase, which will then lead to the actual occurrence..!

And I know that the experiences of taking funds from external parties most of the time are cases that ended in a dishonorable way, and it was one of the reasons for the Jihad in some areas to be paralyzed and destroyed. And you have to consider the words of Abū Muṣʽab Al-Suri while he says regretfully:

"A fatal mistake that destroyed the forefront in the inside, and then destroyed the gathering of the Mujahideen from the outside, and then destroyed the leadership in the field and the administrative military command in Hama and Damascus, was that those involved in the management of the Jihad relied on outside help which was on a shaky and unstable base. It even exceeded by relying on the neighboring hostile regimes. And the revolution expanded and spread in an immature cancerous way nurtured by a flow from the neighboring areas with money, weapons and materials. And there would be certain moments where these supplies would cease or their hopes get disappointed like what happened to the vanguard and then to the leadership of Hama and the command. Such a tragedy happened and it was one of the biggest lessons which was that: "It is impossible for a revolutionary Jihadi movement to carry out a universal guerrilla warfare without relying for their financing, for arming of their units and for their maintenance, on themselves or from what they take from their enemies (war spoils). And it is important for them to plan for this issue with clarity and in detail. Or else they will

[55] Al Mawrid Al Azb Li Bayan Hukm al Isti'ana Bil Kuffar Fil Harb, page 58 & 59

become a political card and a plaything in the hands of others, and if they refuse then their demise is guaranteed by the others." This was a very harsh lesson, and its comprehension came delayed. Those who have been warned should consider".[56]

The individual has to take care and be alert. There is no use if you rebelled against an oppressor and fought against him to only submit yourself to another oppressor behind the borders! Freedom will not be attained except by rebelling against all the oppressors.

Conclusion: Not all taking of funds means being agents. And merely taking funds is not an action of Kufr. Thus it is impermissible to declare the groups as Kaafirs because they merely took funds. But if in addition to taking of funds they become a card in the hands of the Tawagheet who move them in a way that is clear and open like in the case of 'The Euphrates Shield' then you can consider them as Kaafirs and as agents.

And the scholars of Jihad hold the opinion that not all support is impermissible, but the permissible form which they believed in is almost non-existent in these times. For there is not one supporting party – under the conditions laid down by the scholars – that agree to support you without conditions! Rather they definitely have conditions. Therefore the words of the scholars regarding taking support are not applicable in most of the cases when looking at the relations between factions and the support of the funding government.

[56] Observation regarding the Jihadi experience in Syria – Page 5.

<u>Question:</u> Do you agree with me that the description given by the Islamic State for the Taliban as being a nationalistic organization or movement is a correct description? Because the Taliban always speak about Afghanistan and its borders and about the Afghan people only.

<u>The answer:</u> The Taliban movement uses this method – as per what I think – to neutralize the enemies and to make it clear to the neighboring countries that our cause is Afghanistan only, and to pacify those countries, so that there will be no justification for any country to interfere with the affairs of Afghanistan nor to stand against the ambitious movement of whose country they would assault!

But sometimes to see the complete picture it is not enough to look at what is on the table, rather you have to look at what is under the table as well.

The Taliban movement gave permission to some jihadi groups to work outside the borders of Afghanistan. Shaykh Atiyyatullah Al-Libi for example said: "**We, Al Qaeda, are an International Islamic Jihadi organization, which is not restricted to any country or to nationality. And we in Afghanistan have a pledge of allegiance to the commander of the believers Mullah Muhammad Omar Mujahid in the Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan. We have the permission from the commander of the believers to do worldwide Jihadi works**".[57]

The commander of Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula Nāṣir Bin 'Ali al-Ānsī said: "**And we are still on our covenant with Mullah Omar to fight the crusaders and their helpers, and he has given us the authority to do our work and he has delegated us to do it**".[58]

And Shaykh Ayman al-Zawāhirī pledged allegiance to the new leader of Taliban Mullah Akhtar Mansoor with conditions saying: "**We pledge allegiance to you for doing Jihad, and to liberate every inch of Muslim land that has been usurped and taken away; from Kashgar to Andalusia, and from the Caucasus to Somalia and central Africa, and from Kashmir to Jerusalem, and from Philippines to Kabul, Bukhara and Samarkand. And we pledge allegiance to fight the rulers who have been replacing the laws of Allah, who have dominated over the lands of the Muslims and suspended the laws of the Shari'a and imposed the laws of the disbelievers upon the Muslims, and spread corruption and destruction, and forced upon the Muslims apostate subservient regimes that despise the Sharia and made the creed of disbelievers and their philosophies to be superior, and surrendered the lands and the resources of the Muslims to their enemies. And we pledge allegiance to you to give victory to the oppressed believers wherever they are".**[59]

Mullah Akhtar Mansoor replied in an official statement and said: "**I accept the pledge of allegiance of the leader of Al Qaeda organization, Dr. Ayman al-Zawāhirī, and I thank him that along with his**

---

[57] Document: <u>SOCOM-2012-0000007</u>.
[58] Third meeting with al-Malāḥim Media Foundation, second part, January 2015.
[59] The Journey of Loyalty, August 2015, Al-Sahab Foundation.

condolences and consolation, he has also sent us the pledge of allegiance of all the Mujahideen who are under his command”.[60]

Therefore we ask ourselves how can the Taliban be a nationalistic group while it has given permission to the groups and accepted the conditions of those groups to work outside their country?! Is it not logical that if Taliban were a nationalistic group then it would refuse all this and say: If you want to fight, then you can fight only in Afghanistan?!

Additionally, if you describe the Taliban as a nationalistic group and then after giving them this description if you then declare it permissible to spill the blood of their fighters, and excommunicate them (by Takfeer) or kill them, then let the one doing this know that he has made it permissible to spill the blood of Mujahideen based on wrong reasons and false allegations, and so let him prepare an answer for the Day of Judgment.

It has been mentioned in the Hadith that the one who gets killed will come on the Day of Judgment clinging on to his killer and will say to Allah: Oh my Lord, ask him why he did he kill me?[61] And how miserable will you be at that moment when you say that "I made it permissible to spill the blood of a Mujahid who is in the path of Allah based on lies and on incorrect reasons"!

***

The Islamic State says that The Taliban are agents of Pakistan. So we say: Isn’t Pakistan an agent of the U.S.? Did they not give their lands and cooperate with them for the war ‘on terror’ and imprisoned and killed the mujahideen based on the orders of the U.S.?!

Isn’t Pakistan supposed to pressurize and to push their supposed agents - the Taliban - to kill the enemies of the U.S which is Al Qaeda? Aren’t they (Pakistan) supposed to force them (the Taliban) to stop military operations which target their masters the U.S.?! Aren’t the agents - like how some claim - the Taliban, supposed to stand united in one rank with the Pakistani government against the Pakistani Taliban? Aren’t the agents - like how some claim - the Taliban, supposed to forbid the Pakistani Taliban from conducting operations in Pakistan against the Pakistani government?!

---

[60] Statement on the official website of Taliban: “Message of acceptance and appreciation of all those pledging allegiance, from the new leader of the Islamic Emirate”, 14 August 2015

[61] Narrated by Ibn Majah (2611), declared Saheeh by AlAlbani in Saheeh ibn Majah.

<u>Question:</u> Isn't the Islamic State on the truth because all the disbelieving countries fight them? Shaykh Anwar al-ʿAwlākī says: "If you want to know the truth then see where the arrows of the enemy are headed towards". Isn't this all proof that the path of the Islamic State is correct?!

<u>The answer:</u> Just for a clarification, from my reading of the literary works of Shaykh Anwar al-ʿAwlākī, I have not seen him say this, and it likely is incorrectly attributed to him.

Another issue is that this quote has been mentioned by Abū Muḥammad al 'Adnānī with some modification. He said: "**If you want to know the truth then see who is America's biggest enemy**". [62] Let's assume that the ones who made this claim are correct, however they must answer our questions in order for them to discover that their statement on this matter is wrong.

The U.S. bombardment with the unmanned drones was very intense in Pakistan and Yemen before the revolution in Syria happened. But nothing like this happened in Iraq at all despite the presence of U.S. forces. The U.S. targeted Al Qaeda and not the Islamic State in Iraq. Therefore you see Shaykh Abū Muḥmmad al-Maqdisī saying in his reply to the fabrications of the Islamic State during the year 2014 before the international campaign on them started: "**It is enough for them that the unmanned drones do not strike them nor assassinate them nor look for their likes, rather they are until this moment targeting the lions of sacrifice whom they (ISIS) are still attacking**".[63]

The question here then: Does the intense targeting of the leadership of Al Qaeda and other groups by the U.S and the non-targeting of the Islamic State of Iraq by the US mean that all those other groups were on the truth while the Islamic State was on misguidance?!

If you say: The answer is no, then we say that the U.S. targeting groups and the non-targeting of a group or two is not the correct standard to determine who is correct and who is upon falsehood.

And even now for example, the unmanned drones do not stop bombing Al Qaeda branch in Yemen and did not once bomb the Islamic State's branch in Yemen. So does this then mean that the ISIS branch in Yemen is deviated and the branch of Al Qaeda in Yemen is the one that is on the correct path?!

We leave the answer to ISIS and its supporters who adopt this theory!

The reason that made all these countries wage war on ISIS can be understood. ISIS is an international group and organization which includes many nationalities and races, and they want to bring Jihad to their lands. So it is then logical that those countries will try to wage war against them before ISIS reach their countries. [64]

And this is the reason that made many countries to wage war against ISIS.

---

[62] Speech: Then let us pray and ask for the curse of Allah on the liars, Al-Furqān Media foundation, March 2014.
[63] Repelling the arrows of the depraved ones (from striking) the greatest of the noble ones, May 2014.
[64] My saying that it is an understandable and logical reason does not mean that I support it.

And this will continue even if we remove ISIS and put in its place a communist organization which has no relation to religion at all! Countries will wage war against anyone who jeopardizes their security and their stability regardless of one's creed and his principles that he calls for.

Hitler was considered an enemy to all people while he was upon falsehood. Saddam Hussein was attacked by the U.S., the rulers of the Gulf and other Arab rulers, the Kurds, the Shiites and Iran and Islamic groups and communist groups. (And if you look at Operation Desert Storm which aimed to liberate Kuwait from Iraq then you will see many countries from all the continents joining this operation). And with all that, he was upon falsehood. And the list is long...It is not required for you to have many enemies or to be targeted from many directions to prove that you alone are the only one upon the truth and the rest are upon falsehood.

Question: Is everyone that votes in legislative elections a disbeliever like the Islamic State says? What is your opinion on this?

The answer: All scholars of jihad agree that the action (voting) of the voter is an action of disbelief. But we must understand that when I say that this action is committing disbelief that it does not mean that everyone that practice it are declared disbelievers. Because there is a difference between a general ruling and applying the general ruling on specific persons.

And with that the school of jihad is divided in two (opinions) in the issue of excuse of ignorance. The largest part are those who say that there are situations when the person is excused because of his ignorance, and the second part are those that adopt the treatise of the school of the Najdi preachers in their saying that shirk (associating partners to Allah) has not in the least an excuse of ignorance, for those who fall in it disbelievers, whoever it is.

Those who don't consider ignorance an excuse say they are excused not because of the obstacle of ignorance but rather the obstacle of absence of intent. The deterrents of takfeer are 4 (Compulsion, interpretation, significant ignorance and absence of intent).

And absence of intent is " **That he wants with his saying, or action, truth or good or the allowed, and makes a mistake with absence of intent or forethought [65] ….and therefor he starts with disbelief and he does not mean or intend it and does not want the speech or action of disbelief itself, but he means something else**." [66]

I shall give some examples:

- In Sahīh Muslim was mentioned that Hamzah drank wine and this was before it was forbidden, and he said to the prophet peace be upon him and the companions (Aren't you but servants of my fathers?), Ibn al-Qayyim said: (And he was intoxicated with wine, the prophet peace be upon him did not declare him a disbeliever and he conceded it. And also the companion who said " Oh you disbelievers, I worship what you worship, and we worship what you worship (read a mistake in surah Al-Kafiroon) and this was before wine was forbidden. He was not declared a disbeliever because of absence of intent, and the flow of words on the tongue without intending its meanings)[67].
- In Sahīh Muslim was mentioned that the prophet peace be upon him mentioned a story of the man who lost his camel in the desert, when he found it he said with very intense joy: Oh Allah, you are my servant and I am your lord, the prophet said: (he made a mistake because of his intense happiness) this person did not mean to say that Allah is his servant, but his tongue erred because of his intense joy – for absence of intent in this action – made him not

[65] beneficial answer that participation in parliament and elections are nullifiers of monotheism by Shaykh Abū Muḥmmad al-Maqdisī – Page22.
[66] The The Thalathiniyyah message by Shaykh Abū Muḥmmad al-Maqdisī – Page 36.
[67] A'lam AlMawqi'een (3/66).

disbelieve, therefor Ibn AlQayyim said: (He did not commit disbelief with that even if he came with downright kufr, being that he did not want it)[68].

And we must make a distinction between the person who does an act of disbelief and does not intend and mean it and between the person who does an act of disbelief and intends and means it.

For example: A person stepping on the Qur'an in the dark and he did not intend it, and a person stepping on the Qur'an knowing this book is the Qur'an.

The act is the same but the verdicts are different.

The ignorance regarding the reality of these councils makes most people elect a person, and they do not mean to elect a person who legislates in the disbelieving sense. But because of their ignorance on the mechanics of parliament and the manner in which a decision is made and on what it is based essentially. They think that this place is where they offer services of building roads and infrastructure without meaning anything else.

And on this the scholars of jihad colluded in determining this issue.

Shaykh Abū Muḥmmad al-Maqdisī said: "**The one who looks at the general participants in the elections with the eye of equity, will see this action from the doors of which the intention was obscured with most laymen whom know not of the parliament except that which reaches them from their deputies of the worldly services/utilities. You will see most of them deal with them like councils for worldly services or deputies for services, and many times we witness those carried or wheeled in on wheelchairs, from elderly or old man or like that from the times cut off from reality and they do not know anything about it, perhaps they were wheeled in to elect the sons of their tribes or areas that they contribute in mending, building and advancing their villages.**

The obscuring has increased regarding the issue which is not known nor clear for everyone – I mean the reality of the work of deputies and what they undertake of acts of disbelief – And the man was ignorant of this or obscured from this, rather he would elect a deputy and represent, intending that this will lead to some services for him, his tribe, town or village. This person did not intent to be deputized in actions of disbelief and did not choose it. He is mistaken not deliberate nor intending the actions of those disbelieving legislators, when he elects them.

Therefor the initiative to declare them disbelievers is not allowed except after presenting proof and educating them on the reality of the work of legislating deputies. And what they undertake of actions of disbelief which conflict with the Islamic religion and the oneness of the Lord of the worlds, if after that he insist on voting then he committed disbelief.

[68] A'laam AlMawqi'een (3/81).

Therefor we must know details about the elected between those who intended the choice of legislation and between those who intended something else not legislating, the second one is not declared a disbeliever except after presenting proof"[69].

In another instance he said: "**And here we do not give ignorance an excuse in the section of major kufr, rather in the ignorance of the reality of this council, and accordingly this issue for us is in the section of absence of intent.**

And the picture that the commoner or the ignorant if he knows the reality of these councils on what they progress and that they are legislative councils, colludes with its people on its disbelief religion, accepted I that they have the absolute right to legislate. Or chose them legislators according to the text of the constitution, for us he is a mushrik (polytheist).

But most of the commoners, be it old men or elderly or whoever, they do not know the reality of these legislative disbelief councils, they do not choose nor participate in elections for the sake of choosing legislative lords, rather they do this for the sake of choosing a deputy for them to solve their problems or to serve their interests or service their areas.

This is the intention of most of them, they imagine the game like this and they practice it, the one who has the fundamentals of monotheism and disbelieves in the taghut and his laws, and joined in the elections with this mentality and intention, we say: The apparent of your action is that of disbelief, because we do not know what he intends until he declares (openly), Like the one who said: "Oh Allah you are my servant and I am your lord" The apparent of what he said is disbelief..as long as we do not know he made a mistake not intending that and we say: That they have committed an action of disbelief when they participated, in appearance, in the democratic game which gives the governance to the people not to Allah. But because the situation of the people has the aforementioned obscuration, we do not initiate on applying the verdict of disbelief on these commoners, until we know that one of them intended to elect or choose the legislators and he knows the reality of what he chose. Otherwise he will not be declared a disbeliever until the reality has been made clear on this person about the reality of this legislative council. If he persists after that, we will not be embarrassed to judge him with disbelief"[70].

And the quote of al-Maqdisī is the same which Abū Muṣʿab al-Zarqāwī adopts, Shaykh al-Maqdisī says about Abū Maysarah al-Shāmī when he said that al-Zarqāwī declares anyone (on a specified basis) a disbeliever who votes in the elections and said: "**And these are from the lies of Abu Maysarah, anyone that knows Abū Muṣʿab al-Zarqāwī closely knows that he did not declare the voters disbelievers in general, rather he used to go into detail like in the letter "The beneficial answer" which I wrote in prison, which Abū Muṣʿab al-Zarqāwī read, learned, and was pleased with what was in it. Most likely he would he would be of this issuance; verily that he details the**

---

[69]The The Thalathiniyyah message – Page 334.
[70]The beneficial answer that participation in parliament and elections is a nullifier of monotheism – Page 26.

actions of the voters and not what is apparent, to alert and warn from participating in elections and choosing legislators to protect the side of tawheed" [71].

And I thought that al-Zarqāwī went further than this all! Like what is known that all the salafi groups which entered the parliaments, the reason for that was a verdict (fatwa) from Ibn 'Uthaymeen[72] and Ibn Bāz[73] in its permissibility to join parliaments.

Regarding this Shaykh Abū Qatāda al-Filisṭīnī said: "**A newspaper specific to the Reformation Party in Yemen gathered the sayings of the scholars that allowed this shirki path, when the parliamentary elections flared up in Yemen, and they revealed to the reader that there is no dispute in this issue. Here there is Nasir-ud-Dīn al-Albani (about whom is told that he changed his opinion) and this is Ibn Bāz and Ibn 'Uthaymeen and `Abdur-Rahman `Abdul-Khaliq, and Yusuf al-Qaradawi and Mohammed al-Ghazali...and others which these papers did not recount, all of them allowed the one who wanted reform to nominate himself for parliament, and they obligated the people to vote for the best**"[74].

According to the current State that ibn 'Uthaymeen and Ibn Bāz advised to shirk (ascribing partners to Allah) and because of their verdict the people committed shirk! But did al-Zarqāwī declare them disbelievers?! Maysara Algharib said: "**A coordinator from the brothers inquired about their belief about Ibn Bāz and Ibn 'Uthaymeen, it was clear to them that a brother, (from the peninsula) did not declare them disbelievers; the host was surprised about this and scolded the brother and relayed to him that Shaykh Abū Muṣʿab did declare them disbelievers, and the one who does not declare them disbelievers does not enter the land of jihad. And I did not remain until I raised the issue to our shaykh may Allah have mercy on him – and he became furious and swore that the one who relayed though his tongue the view he does not hold. He ordered his deputy to investigate the issue, and if it was proven on the host, he would be expelled from the group. Then the shaykh said: it is correct that I see them having misguided the Ummah with their verdict but I do not declare them disbelievers, and I swear by Allah that if the brother from the peninsula did not declare "Fahd" a disbeliever I wouldn't have forbidden him from Jihad**" [75].

As for the rest of the scholars of jihad whom adopt a thesis that approaches the thesis of al-Maqdisī, they are Shaykh Abū Qatāda al-Filisṭīnī [76], Shaykh Ahmad al-Khālidī [77], And Shaykh Atiyyatullah al-Lībī [78].

---

71 From his personal twitter account.
72 A widespread audio fatwa on the internet.
73 See: Kuwaiti Society magazine published on 23/05/1989 gregorian.
74 Articles between two paths, Number: 47.
75 Zarqawi as I knew him – (3/6) Al-Furqān Media foundation.
76 Jihad and Ijtihad – Page 89.
77 Explanation and clarification in the verdict of who doubts or hesitates in the disbelief of some Tawagheet and apostates – Page 34.
78 Answers of Al Hisbah – Page 331.

And the other hindrance (to not declare someone a disbeliever even if the act itself is) is that those who nominated themselves for elections claim that if they win they will govern with shari'a directly and not govern with anything that contradicts it, the person who is fooled by them and does not know their reality and votes for them that they govern with shari'a, those we do not declare disbelievers either.

A shar'i from Al Qaeda in Iraq and the Islamic State in Iraq, whom is Abu Maria al-Qurashi – May Allah release him – said [79]: "**and with that, the scholars of guidance have made clear the general verdict on those legislators and their voters – they prevented the people from that whatever they could – and they were loud in this issue until they descended the verdict of disbelief on a specific group and that because of their accurate view and understanding of the reality in which they live in. They excused people from the commoners whom are overwhelmed by ignorance, and the representation of Islam was taken over by lying people; they saw them say "in Islam is religion and state, vote for us and we will raise the flag of monotheism high", and when they leave to their devils in the parliaments of disbelief, they swear with their most powerful belief that they are democrats, worshiping the majority aside Allah, whatever the majority wants we will carry it out**" [80].

But did the Islamic State and their previous shar'is really declare the voters disbelievers?!

- Al Qaeda in Iraq issued an official statement – it is to this day present in the pulpit of Tawheed and Jihad – which said: (**As for going to the ballot boxes of the constitution polytheists, and the deceptive call to the commoners to say: "No": this is acknowledging their legitimacy, because their items allowed the voter to say with his voice "Yes" or "No" and they made themselves partners to Allah in legislating, fabricating truth which was not sent down with authority.**

And be warned from going to the ballot box, because it is apostasy from the religion of Allah Almighty whether you say : "Yes" or "No", because the means have the verdict of the purpose, because they mock you when you go the ballot box to say : "No" You because of this action agree on their way and their approaches in the issues of offering our religion and legislation on referendum. This issue is very dangerous so be warned of its fatality; because we do not ever accept that our religion to be susceptible to acceptance or refusal.

What rests is to alert to an important issue in this situation:

The issue is, we say and believe in; the disbelief of going to referendums, does not mean that those who go to referendums are disbelievers specifically, because the people here could have been betrayed by the leaders of misguidance whom made the people understand that they are obligated to rebut this constitution and that it is a form of denying vice. And because of this

[79] It seems like he was close to the leadership, which is clear in his article (Islamic Emirate in Iraq), and Abū Maysarah al-Shāmī supplicated to Allah to free him, and he was mentioned in his article (Between two paths 3) as a person that represent the correct manhaj as opposed to the deviated manhaj which is represented by al-Zawahiri!

[80] Suppressing Fitna in its cradle – Page 94.

suspicion we can not say that those who go to the referendums are disbelievers specifically (on contrary to generally).

Shaykh AlIslam Ibn Taymiyyah may Allah have mercy on him said: " The action or saying could be disbelief, and the verdict of disbelief is put down on the one who said this saying, or did the action, and says: And whoever said this then he is a disbeliever, or who did this action is a disbeliever; the verdict of disbelief is not applied on him until the proof has been presented of which,if left, he would disbelieve, and this issue is constant in the warning texts with Ahlusunna waljama'a. It is not attested that any of the people of the Qibla are in hellfire, permitting that no passed requirement or proven hindrance reaches him") [81].

- While Turkī al-Binʿalī, whom is the shar'i administrator in The Islamic State, went further than this all.

And said that the clerks who write and work in the parliaments and help the parliamentarians are not disbelievers straightaway, rather conditions must be met and hindrances avoided! And he said: "**My verdict on those that work in legislative parliaments is like the clerks and other employees, they are a group of disbelief; they are helping the deputies – legislative ones – they support them in the legislative work. The prophet peace be upon him graded the specific between the action and the doer, therefor the scholars proportioned the verdict of apostasy and the verdict of the direct action in the cime. As for specific (personal) declaring disbelief, it is dependent on the availability of the conditions of takfeer on them and the absence of hindrances on them**" [82].

He thus did not judge them to be disbelievers (specific) directly, rather he staye to see if the conditions are met and the hindrances were absent!

- As for Abū Muḥammad al 'Adnānī, he said: "**Oh Ahl Sunna in Iraq, it is time for you to know the truth of your politicians who for long years remain to drag you to the dark tunnel of democracy. They suck your anger and they shut down what erupted from your volcanoes. So you participate in other new elections that you live another time in humiliation, shame, death and imprisonment, so be warned that you be stung from the same hole**" [83].

This text confirms that there was a faction who participated in the elections and entered the tunnel of democracy more than once, and with that they still did not declare them disbelievers but he describes them as believers and that they are "Ahl Sunnah"!

This older presentation is completely contradicts their new presentation, for example when they tried to topple Abū Muṣʽab Al-Suri and say that he is deviated. Abu Maysarah mentioned issues that makes Abū Muṣʽab Al-Suri deviated because of them and from these issues are: that he "**Does not**

[81] Statement (Mutashaaq Alsayf Almathoor Liabtaal AlIstiftaa Aldustoor) Published by the Sharia committee in Al Qaeda in Iraq, date: Thursday 18 Sha'baan 1426 hijri
[82]Summary of speeches in answers, Sanam Al-Islam network – Page 57.
[83]Speech: Seven realities, Al-Furqān Foundation, January 2013

make takfeer on the tawagheet of the Brotherhood (Ikhwaan) nor their electors” [84], from the indications of the deviation of Abū Muṣʿab Al-Suri is that he does not declare the brotherhood, who ran in the election, disbelievers and he does not declare those who voted for them disbelievers! And through the movements which we relayed before we will know that not only Abū Muṣʿab Al-Suri deviated but also Abu Maria al-Qurashi who did not declare those who voted for the islamists disbelievers!

As for the article that was published officially, which is (**The murtadd vote**), was mentioned: (**These verses and others prove that the "muslim" voter is a murtadd taghut, whose blood is obligatory to spill unless he repents**) [85]. The person that votes is a taghut! This means that their previous leaders did not declare the tawagheet disbelievers! Then why do they say that Al Qaeda deviated because they do not declare the tawagheet disbelievers and their own leaders do this action themselves?!

And then, in an official statement regarding declaring the polytheists disbelievers, they said: "**The obstruction in declaring the disbelief of polytheists "ascribed to Islam" perpetrated negators gathered on them;…..even if the issue emerged with the emergence of religion and loudness of voice and fulfilling its call " like what happened in the Islamic State may Allah give it honor", there is no consideration for suspicion in delaying the shar'i verdict. And declaring the polytheists disbelievers is an issue proven in the clear and widespread known texts which is understood by the people. And the presentation of proof is delivered by the Qur'an as fact or judgement, the manifestation of the issue of takfeer (declaring disbelief) of polytheists is the principle**" [86].

The voter for you is a polytheist (mushrik) but what is the verdict of who abstained in declaring him a disbeliever? Or described him to be a believer and from Ahl Sunnah and Jama'a?! Are the scholarly leaders who abstained and who did not declare the voters disbelievers previously also disbelievers?!

* * *

And when the recording of Ahmad bin 'Omar Al Hazimi was published, and he was defending the Saudi government, describing those who diverged from the government that they are khawarij and then changed and declared the government disbelievers, and when some leaders within the leadership of AlArkan AlSuriya who left to The Islamic Front (al-Jabhat al-Islāmiyyah) and wrote a statement confirming governing with islamic shari'a, and when the Zinki group had certain previous stances which are completely different from the principles of the entity (now) whom became within it and it is Hay'at tahreer AlShaam.

---

84 article: blurred symbols, Abū Maysarah al-Shāmī, May 2016.
85 The Murtadd Vote, Al-Hayat Media Center, November 2016.
86 Statement Number (155) Published by the central office pursuing the shari'ah offices of The Islamic State, date: 29 May 2016.

The islamic state said all these changes are no lesson nor does it have any worth! Rather from the conditions of repentance: (**Admitting on what they were on of disbelief, and regretting it**) [87].

Meaning that these people must go out and renounce their sayings and previous stances or else it is not decisive even if they joined a new entity of which the principles are completely contradictory to their previous stances!

We then say: And you as well, your change does not relieve these personalities from going out and openly declaring their repentance from their previous sayings. Or else their sayings are still settled on them! Even if the State (Isis) presently adopts stances that contradict completely with the original state of these leadership personalities, we then also say that these groups and entities which these people joined, completely differ from the original state of these older leadership!

Either we excuse them all, or all of them go out and renounce their sayings. You Can't require issues on your opposition and not apply them on yourself!

* * *

In conclusion: we passed along this issue quickly and we did not give it its due right of investigation and multiple reviews, transitions and sayings of the salaf in this issue. But we request from the media foundations to open the book (Index of the most important scientific issues in tawheed and jihad) by the internationally wanted Ahmad al-Zahrani (aka: Abu Maryam Al-Azdi) and look on the page (10) and to look at the references which were mentioned by Abu Maryam under the title: (Participation in the parliaments and elections), and then to translate all these parts into their own languages.

[87] Statement of the legislative body of the Islamic State regarding the Islamic Front and their leadership -Page 13.

(These are questions from one of the brothers who were absent inside prison for long years, he used to always send me articles supporting the Islamic State and their doubts thus I answer him as much as I can. And through the context of the answer you will know what his question was or what the content was of the article he sent me).

- Firstly let us agree that, the action of Al Qaeda in not targeting the Arab Spring governments, that it was to delay jihad and an appeasement to the apostates – Like you said – the blame and admonition then does not fall on Al Qaeda only. Because the Islamic State, who says that they do not follow Al Qaeda and are not bound to the commands of Al Qaeda, was it not al 'Adnānī that said: (And the – decisions of Al Qaeda – were not carried out inside the State, likewise they are not bound to it) [88] and with that it agreed with the orders of Al Qaeda – which it is not bound to – in not targeting the nations of the Arab Spring! al 'Adnānī said: (**And because of Al Qaeda: The State did not involve in Egypt or Libya or Tunisia, and it kept suppressing its anger, and curbed the restrain of its soldiers in the passing years**) [89].

And the one who agrees with a person on a mistake is bound by the consequences of this mistake. The State committed itself to the decision of Al Qaeda and agreed to cease hostilities and to delay jihad etc… Then all descriptions which were ascribed to Al Qaeda should also be ascribed to The State because of their participation in the same mistake!

And if said that The State corrected its mistake, then Al Qaeda did aswell, because in all these nations, branches of Al Qaeda were established like:

- ‘Uqbah bin Nafi’ Battalion in (Tunisia).
- Ansar AlShari’a group in (Libya).
- Jund AlIslam group in (Egypt).

And All these groups are engaged in armed activity!

As for the issue of the cease of hostilities or delayed targeting certain countries for predominant benefits then this is not an issue. And Al Qaeda has done this with the Syrian government during the U.S. war on Iraq, Abu Yazan Al-Shami, reviewing what came in the debate that happened between him and al 'Adnānī and some Islamic State leaders, said:

“**I said to them: Lu’ay Al-Saqa security administrator for the organization (Tawheed Wa AlJihad), (Al-Qaeda in Iraq) after that, met with Asif Shawkat, president of Syrian military intelligence in Germany in the beginning of the U.S. war on Iraq. And they agreed that you don’t approach us and we won’t approach you, and this agreement is known. al 'Adnānī interfered and said: These words are incorrect, I said to him: Lu’ay AlSaqa is still alive….., he said: I know, I said: good, and**

[88] Speech: Apologies Oh leader of Al Qaeda , May 2014, Al-Furqān foundation.
[89] Previous source.

who was with him in his issue was with us now and if you want we will send his sons to ask him a second time and to return.

Abu Jameel Qutb interfered and said: correct, these words are known, and mentioned in the media, and nobody can deny this, Abu Muslim and Abu Bakr said: This is the first time we hear these words, we said: that is natural because you are new to jihadi experience so you don't know these things" [90].

We have to give some clarifications here: which is that some leaders from Ahrar al-Sham which were killed in the famous event were mostly (Salafi Jihadi) and participated in a way or another in the Iraqi jihad within the ranks of Al Qaeda. And were imprisoned because of this, they were eyewitnesses of certain events, and the other issue is that Lu'ay AlSaqa was available for communication and they could confirm this information but they cared not for it.

As for Shaykh Osama bin Laden, of which the path they claim to walk on, we did not see him disagree with al-Zawahiri in the decision which they criticized him for, for he called to a cease of hostilities with the Yemeni government, and said: "**and tribal shaykhs to accomplish a practical truce among them ،which will help the stability of Yemen. Even though we learned that Ali Abdallah Salih will not be able to agree on the truce ،proving that the government is escalating the situation to an internal fight and the government has no authority. Therefore ،the people of Yemen will continue supporting the mujahidin. The government will be responsible for the war ، not us**" [91].

And he also said about the cease of hostilities with the Pakistani government: "**In regards to the truce with the Pakistani government ،continuing the negotiations in the way you described is in the interest of the Mujahedeen at this time**" [92].

And he called for a cease of hostilities also with his main opponents (The west) in an official recording: "**And we do not object a response from you to a long term truce, on just terms, to grant security and stability to both parties of the truce, to rebuild Iraq and Afghanistan which were destroyed by war, and there is no shame in this solution**" [93].

So what is delaying the targeting of the Arab Spring nations deviation and al-Zarqāwī and Shaykh Osama not deviated in spite that they fall in the same category which is to avoid some nations and making truces and agreements with them?!

***

[90] Details of the debate with The Islamic State organization - Page 8.
[91] Document: SOCOM-2012-0000016
[92] Document: CR-019-S-4-RJD-Originial-10-432.
[93] Speech: The way to end war, January 2006, Al-Sahab Foundation.

- Secondly many people that support the Islamic State without paying attention to their ideology and its echoes, you see it not declaring the Islamic jihadi groups disbelievers, which the Islamic States describes as disbelieving groups and organizations. And they do not declare the voter a disbeliever and sometimes they do not declare the “Islamic” deputies disbelievers, and they described the one who delays in declaring these types with misguidance. Therefor we will find a very large part of misguided people – according to the Islamic State – that support it.

This is by default, but someone might come and argue with you in issues that do not need clarification. Namely, that there is a segment that supports The State that falls in what the state sees as matters that make the owner deviated, like what was presented with us in the issue of voting etc.. and he says to you that this is not correct and there is no proof and you can’t establish it! Therefor we need to prove to him from the established issues from the presentations of The State.

In an official magazine of the Islamic State was written: (**While the doctrine of the organization and its methods were established before Atiyyatullah and Abū Yaḥyā and Salim Al Tarablusi, and they are the real theorists for all the deviations in creed and method in it**) [94].

Later this was confirmed in a news magazine in a later issue and said about Atiyyatullah al-Lībī in the article (Symbols or idols) the following: “**One can't limit the examples upon symbols that some have praised for what they know about them of good, and are ignorant about their falsehood and misguidance,for example the symbols of Al Qaeda like Atiyyatullah al-Lībī and Abū Muṣʽab Al-Suri and many others of leaders of misguidance and heads of affliction**”.[95]

Atiyyatullah and Abū Yaḥyā were the source of the deviations of Al Qaeda, but weren’t these two “s” supporters of your State?! Did not Atiyyatullah wrote the letter “Words in support of the Islamic State in Iraq”?! Did not Abū Yaḥyā al-Lībī speak more than once about you and supported you?!

These two people who are deviated – by your approval – have supported you!

But the question is: Does support to you from deviated and misguided people make you misguided and deviated?! If the answer was: No, then how did al 'Adnānī make the praise of the misguided and deviated to Al Qaeda a sign of its (Al Qaeda) misguidance?!

If we then say that the support of the misguided and the deviated is a sign of your own deviation, is then the Islamic State not deviated?! If we then say it is not a sign of deviation, then the words of al 'Adnānī about Al Qaeda fall and become worthless.

This is from realistic side, as for the shar’i side, some prophets were defended and supported by disbelievers and polytheists!

---

[94] al-naba Magazine, issue: 32 Page 9.
[95] al-naba Magazine, issue: 85 Page 12

The people of Shu’ayb said to the prophet of Allah Shu’ayb : (If not for your family we would surely stone you). [Quran 11:91]

Imam al-Shanketi said in the interpretation “tafseer”: (**The Almighty in this noble verse made clear: that his prophet Shu’ayb, upon him and our prophet peace and blessings, was protected from the disbelievers, and fortified his side because of tribal emotions, and his ties of kinship with his people who are disbelievers.**

This is the proof that the one who holds on to his religion is helped by Allah, and strengthens him with the support of his disbelieving family, like Almighty made clear in another place, like what He said about Salih and his people: (They said: Swear to each other by Allah that we will certainly make a sudden attack on him and his family by night, then we will say to his heir: We did not witness the destruction of his family, and we are most surely truthful).

His side is strengthened because of his disbelieving community, and Allah Almighty said to our prophet peace be upon him: (Did he not find you an orphan and give you shelter), meaning: sheltered you by joining you to your uncle Abu Taleb.

This because of tribal emotions, and ties of kinship, and it has absolutely nothing to do with religion. Being that The Almighty firmly established the prophet peace be upon him by sheltering him with his uncle Abu Taleb is a proof that Allah could bestow upon the firm believer support from his disbelieving family) [96].

Observe how the prophets of Allah in spite of the support of the disbelievers to them did not shake their method (manhaj), how then can it be that the support from some deviated from the believers is a sign that the entire organization are deviated like al 'Adnānī claims?!

***

- Thirdly I spoke previously about the issue of peaceful demonstrations and the lie that Al Qaeda believes it to be an alternative to jihad for change, review my book (Methodological Difference Between ISIS and Al Qaida) and maybe I forgot to additionally mention in this point the issue I found in one of their official productions which is “ Five years for The Islamic State” in its introduction one of their soldiers came and said about the revolutions of the Arab Spring: (Allah Almighty bestowed a good opportunity with the demonstrations). The other replied: Praise be to Allah, The people have entered in the religion of pacifists – according to the claim of al 'Adnānī – And this mujahid says in their official publication: Praise be to Allah (Alhamdulilah) !!!

Thus we have 4 official situations in which The State supported the peaceful demonstrations and supported a pacifist religion! If it then says that they changed their position afterwards, then Al Qaeda also, Shaykh Abu Khubayb al-Sūdānī, member of Shura council in Al Qaeda in The Arabian

[96] Aḍwā' al-bayān (2/198).

Peninsula, has recently said: "**With Jihad, with jihad only shall the lands of Islam be liberated, with sacrificing souls, offering your soul cheaply for the sake of Allah, with thousands of wounded, with thousands of prisoners, with severity and calamity and tests, with resistance and defending, with patience and persistence in it, with this all we shall reap victory and deserve establishment**" [97].

Therefor their words about pacifism fall and became worthless.

Not to mention that Shaykh Sulaymān Al-'Ulwān permitted it. And when the protests happened in Bureyda regarding the prisoners, a few scholars spoke and said that protests are impermissible! Shaykh Sulaymān Al-'Ulwān replied: "**It is permissible with the proof that Imam Ahmad – May Allah have mercy on him – when he was imprisoned the people and students gathered in a very large gathering near the Khalifas residence, they protested his imprisonment and appealed to AlMa'moon to pardon him and guarding the believers from the trial of the creation of Qur'an...Imam Ahmad was rejoiced with this and narrated this with a saheeh And I mentioned many proofs of its existence in the time of the prophet peace be upon him and in the time of his companions may Allah be pleased with them.**

And Ibn 'Umar did this in what was narrated by Ibn Sa'd in AlTabaqat that 70 women passed the prophet's house peace be upon him who were complaining about their husbands, and narrated by Abu Dawud as well from the hadith of Iyas ibn 'Abdullah and its chain is saheeh. And in the fourth and fifth century protests occurred and nobody renounced this and this is from ordaining good and forbidding evil" [98].

***

- As for the issue of the one that fight them are disbelievers, they themselves fell in this laughable contradiction, al 'Adnānī said: "**Be warned that with your fighting the Islamic State you fall in disbelief**" [99]. While before he used to say: "**And we will stay loving them while they hate us, and keep giving them victory even if they betray us, and we wish their life even if they want our death**"[100]. Note that they want his death and in spite of that he loves them and wants them to live!!

And we do not know if al 'Adnānī was going to love people who had fallen in disbelief according to his new foundation?!

***

- As for the issue of the burning of the Jordanian pilot Muʿādh al-Kasāsbeh, - There are a few notions:

---

[97] Somalia, reaping patience and steadfastness – Page 4.
[98] Collection of verdicts: (Here) Strange that what they relayed and what was relayed to support their stance are supporters of the Islamic State back then in going out to demonstrations for the prisoners in Saudi Arabia!
[99] Speech: Oh my people respond to the callers of Allah, June 2015, Al-Furqān foundation.
[100] Within a speech in the production: The spring of Anbar, January 2013, Al-Furqān foundation.

1) The Islamic State inserted the name Sajida al-Rishawi to be included in the exchange deal with the Japanese after killing the Jordanian pilot by burning! Which made Jordan afterwards to take advantage of this to take revenge for the burning of the pilot! A consideration was made to kill the woman The State demanded as a repercussion! So even if the Jordan government executed Sajida without the demand of The State, then it is not allowed for us to blame The State for her killing.

2) The State used a quote of Ibn Taymiyyah as proof: "**If in exemplifying was predominantly a call to belief and to deter from them hostilities then in this is establishing the limits (ordained by Allah) and legitimate jihad**" [101]. Thus they said exemplifying is allowed because of two reasons (a call to belief and to deter hostilies).

As for the call to belief, it made most of the Jordanian streets queue with The Coalition against The State as revenge for the killing of the pilot! Is this then belief for The State?!

As for deterring the hostilities; the enemy was not deterred, rather Jordan increased their flight missions more than before!! And the government of Jordan declared that it will enter a war with no lenience, instead of the burning of al-Kasāsbeh being a deterrent – like The State thinks – it became the opposite!

Then the two reasons The State used as proof were incorrect. Since what they used as proof was not achieved, rather the opposite happened, thus they must acknowledge that the burning of the pilot was a mistake.

3) The filming of his burning and spreading it in high quality; made the people ignore or forget that Muʿādh al-Kasāsbeh was bombing Raqqa and that he is included in the coalition which killed believing civilians! Rather the image was flipped, and made the people sympathize with him, and made the street accept engaging in war against The State and participating in the coalition after they were split or uninterested!

4) The Imam Ibn Qudama al-Maqdisi al-Hanbali conveyed the consensus that if an enemy was overpowered – meaning became a prisoner – then it is not allowed to burn him. The Imam said: "**as for the enemy if he was overpowered then it is impermissible to burn him with fire and there is no dispute regarding this**" [102].

***

- As for your request that I return to some testimonies which were published in the "Dābiq" magazine, I returned to one of them and found in it clear lies! For example the testimony of Abu Jareer al-Urduni who was in Al Qaeda in Khorasan and it was mentioned in the official Dābiq Magazine issue nr. 6 under the title (**Al Qaeda in Waziristan – Witness from inside**), in it was said:

---

[101] The Grand Verdicts (545/5).
[102] al-Mughnî (9/230).

“**Sometime after the attacks of September 11th , Shaykh Usamah ibn Laden (Rahimahullah) explicitly declared the apostasy of the rulers of AlHaramayn and their soldiers and the obligation to fight them in some of his addresses. The obstacles preventing the unification of the ranks of the mujahid muwahhidin – Az-Zarqawi and his jama’ah, and ibn Laden and his organization – were thereby removed**” [Page 42]

They say that Shaykh Usamah did not declare the rulers of Saudi disbelievers except after 11th of september and before did not do it or did not do it openly!!!

Firstly: Shaykh Usamah ibn Laden in the statement ,(The suffering of Bosnia and the betrayal of the custodian of the two holy mosques) which is the statement Nr. 18 from a series of statements of the body of advice and reform, said: “**we have prepared in the previous statements, and in particular the statement nr. 17 of what the government has reached – meaning the Saudi government – of exiting from the folds of Islam and apostasy from it**”.

Question/ What was the date on this statement? It is in the year 1416 corresponding to the year 1995! Which is 6 years before 11th of September!

And Shaykh Osama bin Laden sent a message to King Fahd beginning it with: “**To the king of Najd and Hijaz Fahd bin ‘Abd Al’Azeez: Peace be upon those who follow guidance, to continue**…”[103].

And this formulation (Peace be upon those who follow guidance) is only said to the disbeliever, this means that he declares him a disbeliever!

And what was the date of this letter? It was also in the year 1995!

And he also said: “**Some people are still restrained (in declaring disbelief) on King Fahd, but we see that if we applied the shar’i judgment on him then he has taken the Jews and Christians as supporters and he ruled with laws other than Allahs’ law and our scholars, mufti of our homeland, Shaykh Muhammad Ibrahim – Allahs mercy on him – and many others have given the verdict that he committed disbelief because of his ruling without Allahs law, a clear issue that does not need many words**”.

And he said this in a speech “Bushrayaat” (glad tidings) which was recorded year 2000 which is before 11th of september by a year!

These are three occurrences which prove that Shaykh Osama bin Laden declared disbelief on the Saudi king before 11th of september not like Abu Jareer claims!

And this is the first fallacy.

[103] speech to Abi Ri’al, 3 August 1995.

Secondly: There is leveling done for the reason of unification and merger of al-tawḥīd wa al-jihād group in Iraq to Al Qaeda, and the reader might understand that by merely Shaykh Osama bin Laden declaring the rulers of Saudi a disbeliever , that Zarqawi pledged allegiance! And this is incorrect, and even if this was the only obstacle then they would have unified earlier, especially since Shaykh Osama ,like what was just presented, had declared the Saudi government disbelievers since the mid 90s! The obstacle after overcoming it , after the pledge of allegiance was completed, was the acceptance of Al Qaeda to the strategy of Abū Muṣʿab al-Zarqāwī in Iraq, And the letter in which Abū Muṣʿab al-Zarqāwī lays down his strategy is available in the compilation of his works and speeches (from page 56 to 73).

And he sealed it with: " **This is the view we have explained, and this is our path that we clarified, if you agree with us on this and are pleased with it for us as a method and path, and are satisfied with our idea of fighting the apostate factions then we are a present army for you, work under your banner and descend on your command, rather we pledge our allegiance openly on everybody and in the media to anger the disbelievers, and acknowledgement to the eyes of the people of Tawheed, and on that day the believers are happy with the victory of Allah, and if it appeared unlike this, then we are brothers and do not let dispute spoil amicability, we help each other on good and mutually support each other on jihad, awaiting your answer**" etc.

The declaring disbelief of the rulers of Saudi or their army was not included as a condition in the strategy of Abū Muṣʿab al-Zarqāwī to pledge allegiance to Osama bin Laden!! Or declaring any other rulers as disbelievers, rather ,and contemplate on what he said, even if Al Qaeda did not accept fighting (the apostate factions in Iraq) he said: "**We are brothers and do not let dispute spoil amicability, we help each other on good and mutually support each other on jihad**" and he did not say this as proof that they are deviated nor that their method was corrupt like how The State now claims! And this clarifies to you that the method (manhaj) of al-Zarqāwī is different from the current manhaj of The State.

#- Abu Jareer said on page 43: "**of 2010 ،but the Rāfidah kept some brothers in their prisons ، amongst them the two aforementioned brothers who did not give bay'ah to al- Qā'idah: Khālid al-'Ārūrī and Suhayb al-Urdunī. I believe that the reason for them not being released was the absence of bay'ah from them to the Tandhīm**".

Meaning that the Iranian government did not accept to release jihadists from their prisons except if they were of Usamahs Al Qaeda?!

If that is the issue then what is the difference between it and Aymans Al Qaeda?

In comparison to this, Usamahs Al Qaeda is then more deviated from Aymans Al Qaeda! Because for Usamahs Al Qaeda, the Iranian government made the pledging a condition to release the brothers from the prisons! As for Aymans Al Qaeda they only praise them!

But was what he said correct? If the answer was correct: Then how was Abu ‘Abdullah released from the Iranian prisons and he was not under pledge of allegiance to Al Qaeda?!

Shaykh Atiyyatullah al-Lībī while listing the names of prisoners which were released by iran and mentioned among them: (**Saalim Al-Masri “affiliated to the Jama’at AlJihad” with his family**) [104].

This because some affiliated to Jama’at AlJihad were not satisfied with Dr. Ayman al-Zawāhirī giving his pledge of allegiance to Shaykh Osama bin Laden. They held on to the name of their old organization which is Jama’at AlJihad and they are a minority, but the lesson is look at how the Iranians accepted releasing him in spite of him not having a pledge of allegiance to Al Qaeda rather he refused to give his pledge of allegiance!

This is the second lie then.

Abu Jareer on page 44 said: “**After a few days from me reaching Mīrānshāh ،I was threatened and scolded by the amīr of the Shar’ī Committee of Tandhīm al-Qā’idah for using the word “Rāfidī” to describe Iran where I was held as a prisoner for a period of about 8 years**”.

He wants to convince us that the level at which al-Qaeda has degenerated has become threatening and reprimanding to those who use the word "Rafidi"!

And I do not know then why Al Qaeda published a speech of Abū Yaḥyā al-Lībī (Tragedies of Levant between the crimes of the Nusayris and plots of the west) which was released in the time of Shaykh Ayman – by the way – in which the shaykh used the word “Rafidi”!

The word “rafidi” then is used in the literature of Al Qaeda and in their official statements, and then he wants to convince us that Al Qaeda forbids using this term!

And this is the third lie.

These three lies were documented and were officially issued by the magazine Dabiq one of the media branches of the Islamic state.

As for the second testimony of Abu ‘Ubayda Al-Lubnani who was the administrator of Al Qaeda in Khorasan and was dismissed early after his appointing by a month for incompetence. The Islamic State took advantage of the fact that he was a previous leader and it did not mention that he was dismissed and tried to take advantage of him, his testimony was presented full of defamation and lies, Brother Abu Kareemah Al-Khorasani responded to him and of what was said is:

(- **Abu ‘Ubayda said: That Shaykh ‘Asim ‘Umar has succeeded Shaykh Ahmad Farooq (may Allah have mercy on him) in the leadership of the Indian subcontinent after the latter was killed, in spite that the group from the beginning in their foundation announced in their media that Shaykh**

---

[104] Document: SOCOM-2012-0000012.

‘Asim ‘Umar was the Amir (leader) and that Shaykh Ahmad Farooq was his second in command. And this if it proves anything it proves that the man speaks about issues he does not even know the foundations of.

- Then in his interview was said that Al Qaeda in the Indian subcontinent was opposed to fighting the tawagheet of Pakistan, and he forgot or pretended to that the first military operation of this blessed group was against the Pakistani Navy).

The common denominator between these two testimonies are that they claim issues and then it is officially proven to be incorrect rather even lies and disputes!!!

How do you want me then to believe the rest of the testimonies?! And what guarantees to me that the other testimonies do not have lies in them like these or even bigger and more lies?! They have no credibility so that a person can take their words into account, rather it came to dealing with their words with suspicion and doubting many lies.

And from their lies also what was mentioned by the one who defected from them Abu Al’Ataa AlSan’ani in an observed production talking about the reason of his defection, he was part of the production (Iba Al Daym – Wilayat ‘Adan Abyan) in it the brother Abu ‘Ataa says:

“**The media administrator He Asked us to go with him to act some scenes. The first scene was: combating with a mountain to delude the viewer that we are engaging with Houthis**

This scene appeared in the film as show in front of you.

This person who is in front of you is me, and the other is Farouk al-Hadrami.

We appears more than once on this film

The second scene: We represent role of the Houthis who were fleeing from the shooting of the islamic apostate soldiers.

The third scene: The media administrator has asked us to attack a shelter we were living in, and is was in hadramout to delude the viewer that this house was a hideout for the Houthis” [105].

Then in the end he declare that he does (mubahalah) that what he mentioned is true and he challenges the one belying him to a (mubahalah), and not one person did a (mubahalah) with him to this day!!!!

And this nature of loving to exaggerate, lies, forgery and deception is an old issue for them and it’s not new. Shaykh Abu Sulayman al-’Utaybī, judge in Al Qaeda in Iraq and in The Islamic State in Iraq, said:

[105] The Hollywood reality of Al-Baghdadi group, February 2016.

"**And many of what is produced of operations carried out by brothers through 'Al-Furqān foundation" media is either old or is reused in another production like "Operation free the prisoner" which is an operation to free prisoners which was in the time of Abū Muṣʿab – may Allah have mercy on him-, which is now a new release of the Islamic State in Iraq, or it is released on its reality but things are amplified or added in it. And a lot of what is announced is either lies or exaggerations. Like how they announced that the mujahideen attacked Badosh prison in Mosul and that they released the prisoners and this was not true, rather they made an agreement with the police and gave them money and they showed us that it was a battle and victory! And the enemy knows it was not a battle, thus the lies here are on the brothers and not on the enemy, and there are many of these examples**" [106].

And then you expect from me to accept everything that is presented in their media?!

***

- As for the specificities regarding the letter of Turkī al-Binʿalī to al-Maqdisī [107] in which the deviation of al-Zawahiri was proven and what clarified this deviation is his quote (*Mister Obama, I hope Allah perishes him*), and the one that says to a hypocrite or a disbeliever "Oh Sir" then Allah is displeased with him – like in the text of the hadith -.

- Firstly: The authenticity of the hadeeth has been looked into, the first two issues are that Qatāda - one of the narrators of the hadith - was not mentioned to have heard the hadith from 'Abdullah Ibn Buraydah who is the next person in the chain! And the second issue: Mu'adh ibn Hicham is known for his mistakes and delusions in relaying, return to this link on one of the forums that the details be clarified to you (Here).

-Secondly: Assuming that the hadith is saheeh, Dr. Ayman al-Zawāhirī words were formulated as sarcasm or mockery. In the Arabic language and with the Arabs this is known as a metaphor sarcasm, like what Allah Almighty said about Abu Jahl: "Taste you (this)! Verily, you were (pretending to be) the mighty, the generous!" [Sura Ad-Dukhaan : 49]. And the linguists said: an example of sarcasm, using the word: smart on a dumb person, or master on a slave.

And if you want other similar linguistic examples that happened to the companions or the tabi'een or even the former Arabs regarding using Sir sarcastically or as an insult then review the message (The Husayniyah lightningbolts) by Shaykh 'Abdullah Al Husayni??? who is one of the students of al-Maqdisī, and what I have presented here is merely a part from this message.

- Thirdly: Let's assume that what we mentioned in the second part is incorrect and that what Shaykh Ayman al-Zawāhirī said is a deviation, then you must apply this description on all who support this usage, Shaykh Anwār al-ʿAwlākī said: "**For example, you in Al Qaeda , your way of**

[106] Letter to Shaykh Usamah ibn Laden – Page12.
[107] Some of it was mentioned in (Statement about the situation of The Islamic State in Iraq and Levant and the due attitude towards them) issued on 27/Rajab/1435 Hijri.

addressing represents the jurisprudence of honor, for example Dr. Ayman al-Zawāhirī when he addressed Obama, what did he say to him? He said: " Oh mister Obama, may Allah make the end of the United States on the hands of the Mujahideen, that we may rest and the world rest from your evil" This represents an honorable addressing" [108].

It seems that Shaykh Anwar al-ʿAwlākī supports Shaykh Ayman al-Zawāhirī in this deviation? And the person who rationalizes deviation is he then also not deviated?! We will leave the answer to you!

***

- As for them dropping scholars and endearing those who support them as scholars! In spite of that the issues for which they dropped the scholars for is present in the scholars whom they try endear to! [109]

Let's give an example for this, Abū Maysarah al-Shāmī said: "**The students of jihad – in the time when jihad became duty – did not take knowledge from those who stayed behind and skipped (jihad), and they gave precedence to the knowledge of those who were dead of imams of tawheed and jihad over the arts of those contemporary immorals who stay behind, they were followers and not innovators, lead by the scholars of guidance, the martyred leaders, like Abu Mus'ab al-Zarqāwī and Abu Hamza al-Muhajir and Abu Omar al-Baghdadi, may Allah have mercy on them and raise their status. And through those who stayed behind who think optimistically about the official scholars of tawagheet, the ranks of the mujahideen after the "Arab Spring' has been infiltrated by Al Salool**" [110].

al 'Adnānī has confirmed these meanings in his speech (Oh people, answer the caller of Allah), when he spoke about those who stayed behind, and spent their lives in the presence of females, not renounce the tawagheet nor went out for jihad! And their ribat is in the social media websites, and they have not shot one bullet, and they did not witness one battlefield with the mujahideen!

The strange thing is that these characteristics – without exception – are present in Dr. Khalid Al-Hayek!

Whom is fawned to by the supports of The State! You see them be lenient with his knowledge and they call him our Scholar the Muhaddith!

If the scholars of jihadm who spent their lives fighting the Tawagheet, who are not excused for not going out to jihad even if they were forbidden from travel, how then with the one who is allowed?! And travels between countries?! Between Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Jordan?! If we do not excuse

---

108 Interview with Shaykh Anwar al-ʿAwlākī with al-Malāḥim Media foundation 23 May 2010.
109 wrote this part before and published it under an alias on one of the websites, I decided to include it in the collection of answers and it is not an answer on my friend, rather it is originally an article.
110 Article: Al-Haazimi between The big (sin) of stayin behind and the misguidance of AlJaamiyyah.

those who are under surveillance and the intelligence agencies do not stop following, is it then correct to excuse the one who can travel easily?!

Is Dr. Khalid Al-Hayek for example a murabit on the frontlines or is he like the scholars lnked to the social media websites?! Is Dr. Khalid Al-Hayek included in the sinful of those who stay behind which all other scholars are included in or is he an exception?!

Rather what is even greater is that Dr. Khalid Al-Hayek as on his account on the (Ask.fm) website cites the official scholars of Al Saud like Ibn Bāz and Ibn ‘Uthaymeen and what Abū Maysarah says that by merely thinking optimistically about them deviation happens to the groups!

We do not renounce citing nor do we advise listening to the lectures of those Scholars at all, but the purpose of this narrative is to clarify the contradiction of those in their presentations. The State did not charge itself to warn their supporters of that person on whom all issues were present for which they dropped all other scholars! Because he supports them !!!.

And the second contradiction in this issue is, that Abū Maysarah says that knowledge is not taken from those who skipped on jihad and stayed behind because they are sinners and this is the manhaj of Abu Omar al-Baghdadi. We will shock you that Abu Omar al-Baghdadi – previous leader of The State – called to an initiative and mentioned conditions which had to be available in the partakers in it:

“**That those who fight and fights for the sake of Allah, and takes jihad as worship, and this is an important condition. For those that pushed themselves in the corners of offices working on papers that they may come out with solutions to the problems of guns and bombs without seeing it or learning it someday without a doubt they will detonate it in their own and those who listen to them’s faces. As for issues that are not regarding jihad, they are our imams and are on our heads**” [111].

Notice that those scholars did not wage jihad although he said: (as for issues that are not regarding jihad , they are our imams and are on our heads) meaning that they listen to them and take from them issues that are not jihad and they put them above their heads, Did Abu Omar al-Baghdadi consider sinners imams for him?!

We will surprise you that they themselves used to take knowledge from who they now consider those who stay behind and sinners of the likes of al-Maqdisī. The Islamic State sent to Shaykh al-Maqdisī a letter regarding on of their representatives saying in it: “**The most dependable way to teach our brothers in the prisons of Iraq is your website Minbar AlTawheed and your books are the first things the prisoner reads if he wants to become a student**” [112].

[111] The crime of elections and our obligation towards it, 12 February 2010, Al-Furqān Foundation.
[112] A student of al-Maqdisī relayed it and he is Shaykh ‘Abdullah Al-Husayni in another letter in his book (The lightning of Al-Husayniyyah – Page 26).

How many are their contradictions!

But let me interpret to you the reason of this current attack, they know that most contemporary scholars are against them, thus they do not want any link to be between their sympathizers and those scholars. Because merely by having a link they could be affected by the words of the scholars and this could lead in the end to conviction with the words of the scholars and leaving supporting or giving victory to this State.

They do not want to say this in a direct way, therefor they must wrap this issue in a religious cover that their words are more convincing, thus they say that the one who does not go out (to jihad) is a sinner and knowledge is not taken from sinners! Any scholar who opposes them they will suddenly discover that they are sinners, and it's not allowed to study their books nor taking knowledge from them after they were studying from them and after considering them their scholars!

Therefor:

- If their supporters say that those scholars are sinners etc...then say to them, what about Dr. Khalid Al-Hayek? If he was like them (sinner) then why don't you say that to him and warn against the sinner?!

- And if you were a sympathizer with them and you study the books of the contemporary scholars and they say How can you study?! Say to them I study like you used to study and like Shaykh Abu Omar al-Baghdadi that in issues that are not jihad, there is no issue in taking the words of the scholars (that stay behind)!

***

- As for al 'Adnānī objection on the quote of Shaykh Ayman al-Zawāhirī in his speech about the pagans ,Buddhists, Hindus and others like them, when he said: "**And we are wishful to live with them in peace if an Islamic State was established, soon in sha Allah**" [113], and the saying of Turkī al-Binʿalī commenting on this text: "**If an Islamic State was established then there is no place for Sikhs and Hindus anyway, since the correct of the opinions of the people of knowledge is that only the people of the book or has a similar book can stay in Dar Al-Islam**" [114].

Meaning that jizya is only accepted from the people of the book, and the polytheists have no choice except accepting Islam or the sword! Then I say: a partial acceptance of all polytheists is the manhaj of Imam Malik and AlAwza'i like relayed from them Al-Qurtubi in his tafseer: "**And AlAwza'i said: Jizya is taken from any idol or fire worshiper, or disbeliever or those that falsely deny, and also the manhaj of Malik, for he saw that jizya is taken from all forms of shirk and disbelief, Arab**

[113] General instructions for jihadi work – Page 4.
[114] My previous shaykh, this is the separation between me and you – Page 24.

or foreign, Taghlabi or Qurashi, whatever it is, except from the apostate. Ibn Al Qasim, Ash-hab And Sahnoon said: The jizya is taken from the Majoosi Arab and all other nations” [115].

And their proof is what came in Saheeh Muslim and it is a commandment from our Prophet peace be upon him to all leaders of (military) expeditions and army: (When you meet your enemy from among the polytheists, call them to one of three things. Whichever of them they respond to, accept it from them and refrain from fighting them. Invite them to accept Islam, and if they respond then accept it from them " Until he said:"If they refuse to enter Islam, then ask them to pay the Poll-tax. If they do that, then accept it from them and refrain from fighting them) [116].

Ibn al-Qayyim said commenting on this hadith: "**The scholars differed regarding from who the jizya is taken after they agreed that it should be taken from the people of the book and from the majoos, Abu Haneefa said that it should be taken from the people of the book and the majoos and the idol worshipers from among the foreigners and is not taken from the idol worshipers from the Arabs, And Ahmad used the text narrated by him….The jizya is taken from any disbeliever and this is the apparent from the hadith and no differentiating between this disbeliever and that, it's not said that it was specifically for the people of the book. Because the expression refuses specificity to the people of the book, also the Prophet of Allah in his expeditions and his armies, mostly they would fight the Arab polytheists. And it is not said that the Qur'an specifies the people of the book, because Allah Almighty ordered fighting the people of the book until they give jizya, an the prophet peace be upon him ordered to fight the polytheists until they give jizya. Thus jizya is taken from the people of the book as said in the Qur'an and is also taken from most disbelievers as said in the Sunnah. And the Prophet of Allah has taken jizya from the majoos and they are fire worshipers, there is no difference between them and idol worshipers**" [117].

- Note that the one who says jizya is not taken from polytheists did not say from whom it is allowed to take, he has deviated from the correct manhaj and diverged and became from the people of misguidance, why? Because they know the level and order of the issue, thus there is a controversial issue which does not reach the stage of throwing the other with being deviated. But the fools and ignorants do not know the differences between issues thus they make every ijtihadi issue a core of tawheed!!! If a person would disagree with them he would become an innovator or outside the circle of sunnah!

- Note that even after The Islamic State fell which existed for almost 1300 years, that there still are Buddhists, Hindus, Sikhs and idol worshipers in the areas that The Islamic State used to rule. So I do not know that if all leaders that ruled these areas finished all polytheists off or accepted jizya from them and were deviated?!

[115] Tafseer Al-Qurtubi (10/163).
[116] Saheeh Muslim: 1731.
[117] The Rulings of the People of Dhimma (1/87,88).

And then al-Binʿalī says: "**And even the people of the book or those with a similar book, we do not live with them in peace and quiet, rather the scholars mentioned that from the rules of dhimmah that they live in servility and humiliation**" [118].

There is no conflict between a person living in servility or in peace, a person could live humiliated but his life is secure!

Where is the conflict in the words of Dr. Ayman al-Zawāhirī? There is none!

As for the conflict of al 'Adnānī and the words of al-Zawahiri regarding the Christians and that they are partners in the nation, al-Zawahiri has replied to him saying: "**Rather they continued and claimed that I call for Christians to be partners in governance, and what I said was partners in the nation, meaning in agriculture, trade and finance, we protect their sanctities in it with our Sharia, but it is their determination on lies**" [119].

Then the words of al 'Adnānī fell and became worthless.

In the conclusion, if the lack of encountering, leaving in peace the deviated factions, and lack of fighting them as long as they do not fight us is deviation and perversion and a deterioration of ones manhaj, then Abū Muṣʽab al-Zarqāwī would be deviated because he said: "**And in the land of two rivers are many factions, like the Sabeans, the Yazidi Satan worshipers, the Chaldeans and Assyrians, we did not extent our hands to harm them nor aimed our arrows against them, in spite that they are not linked to Islam at all, but it did not appear to us that they participated with the Crusaders in fighting the Mujahideen**" [120].

Knowing that al-Zawahiri did not give peace to these non-muslim factions at all, rather he said that we do not confront them if they do not confront us, and if they confront us then we will respond to them, for he said in his words: "**No fighting the deviated factions like the Rafidha, Ismailis, Qadyanis and deviates sufis as long as they do not fight Sunnis, and if you fought them then the response is limited to the fighting sides of them. No fighting the Christians, Sikhs and Hindus in the Muslim lands, and if hostilities happen from them then a response proportioned to the hostilities suffices**" [121].

But what do we have to do with those who do not read, and those who read but not understand!

***

[118] My previous Shaykh, this is the separation between me and you – Page 25.
[119] Speech: "To other than Allah we will not bow" which is the fifth part of the series (brief messages to a victorious nation).
[120] The grand children of Al'Alqami have returned, 18 May 2005.
[121] General instructions for jihadi work – Page 3,4.

- As for the issue of announcing to fight all factions, battalions and brigades like al 'Adnānī said: (**We will fight the movements, groups and fronts. We will tear the battalions, brigades and armies until we finish them off, nothing weakens the believers and delays victory except factions**).

Then I say: Even if they were truly a Caliphate, and announced they would fight anyone who does not submit to the command of the Caliphate, then it's not at all allowed to fight them except after sending someone who debates them and calls them and removes any doubts they have laying on their minds. There must be debates, dialogue and discussions before you fight like what the scholars said in the subject of fighting the people of transgression who refuse to submit to the Caliphate [122].

But what happened is that the fighting happened without debates nor discussions rather not even sitting with those who refused to submit to the so-called Caliphate. Even Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula officially requested from this Caliphate with the authorization of the leadership to sit, discuss and debate in order to arrive to the truth but nonetheless The State refused to sit with them and discuss and then declared war on them and on others! [123]

The second issue, we are in a weak situation, and any infighting between us in this situation only benefits our enemy, because any winner of this infighting loses in the end, Abū Muṣʽab Al-Suri said: "**I went and sat with one of the supporters of the Armed Islamic Group in Algeria and he was with us in Afghanistan, so I told him: You are a wise man, so how can you say we will fight the qutbis and the muslim brotherhood and the Salvation front and all those people before the president of Algeria "Zarwaal"?!So he sat and started hitting the floor – and the floor was made of wood because of the cold in London – and the house was shaking because he was hitting the floor and pointing while saying, we are here and Zarwaal is here, and between us and between him – and he hits the floor – saying: Salvation front and the brotherhood and the bro.., then said we will not reach fighting Zarwaal until we kill all of those.I replied: Oh man, when you kill all the qutbis and the qutbis kill the brotherhood and the brotherhood kill the Salvation front and Salvation front kill the rest, one of you will reach peacefully to Zarwaal and Zarwaal will spit on him and he will die**" [124].

The issue then has conflicts with shari'a and reality.

***

- As for the issue of bombing the mosques, like what is known about Yemen is that they are divided by Sunnah and Shi'a, and the Shiite faction are the Zaydis, and they are known as the faction closest to Sunnis. Thus the Sunnah pray together with the Zaydi Shi'a in mosques in Yemen. What

[122] See: The book of Imam Shafi'ee (9/271), Rawdah Al-Talibeen of al-Nawawī (7/277), Al-Hawi Al-Kabeer of Abu al-Hassan al-Mawardi (13/102), Kashf Al Qina' of al-Bahūtī (6/170), Sharh Al-Kabeer of Ibn Qudāmah al-Maqdīsī (Page 66).
[123] Consult the production: The reality of debating with the Baghdadi group, Hidayah Foundation for Media Production, April 2016.
[124] Interview with the Kuwaiti newspaper " Ar-Ra'i Al-'Aam – Page 65.

happened with the Dawa'ish is they came with the mentality of Iraq which is that any Shi'a are Ja'fari or twelvers and they are the same shi'a present in Iraq and Iran. Thus they started to target the mixed conjoint mosques because the Houthi group (which is a Shi'i group which was Zaydi but it changed to Ja'fari) hung their slogans on them or to fight the shi'a without knowing that there is a difference between Ja'faris and Zaydi shi'a and without knowng that the mosques are mixed between Sunnis and Zaydi Shi'a.

And that the victims of the Sunnis were more than the Shi'a in their bombings and they even killed some Shuyukh that were opposed to the Houthis. They mixed up their papers and said: Look at Al Qaeda condoling the Shi'a and renounce targeting them?! But without clarifying which Shi'a they targeted, and what was the issue that Al Qaeda specifically renounced? **The Sunnis that fell victim in those bombings**!

Shaykh Khaled Batarfi, who is a commander in Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, said: "**The mosque which was targeted in San'aa – according to our certain knowledge – is a mixed mosque in which Sunnis and Shi'a pray. And all of their victims are Sunnah and Shi'a, and in the bombing of the Al Mu'Ayyid mosque in San'aa the dead among the Sunnis was manifolds that of the Shi'a dead! And most targeted mosques were in very crowded areas in the markets, and at prayer time the place is filled with the common people, like the Al Sayah mosque in Shu'oob.**

And the people do not differentiate between the mosques of the Houthis or others, especially after the Houthis took control of all mosques and hung on them their slogans. And among the dead that fell in the bombing of Al Mu'ayyid mosque were fathers and brothers and family of many of our mujahideen brothers which we know by their names. Their only sin was that they prayed in the mosques like others from the common people do!" [125].

The names of some of the Shuyukh whom fell in this random bombing:

1. Shaykh 'Ali Al Mashrifi
2. Shaykh Khaled Al Tayfi
3. Shaykh Naseem Wahbaan
4. Shaykh 'Abd Al Mawlaa Dabwaan

These are from the Sunnis and are enemies of the Houthis! [126]

***

- As for the usage of the term (Baqiya) in the perspective of Shari'a, because what is forever (Baqiyah) is the face of Allah and anything else shall perish and even this State and it will not stay (forever), Allah Almight says in the Qur'an: (Whatsoever is on it (the earth) will perish*And the Face of Your Lord full of Majesty and Honor will abide forever) [Sura Ar-Rahmaan : 26-27].

---

[125] Speech: Bombings of mosques; disassociation and advice, October 2015, al-Malāḥim Media Foundation.
[126] al-Masrā Newspaper, Number 47, Page5.

***

As for your question: Are the khawarij those who declare a disbeliever with major sins? And the person who does not declare takfeer on major sins is not a kharidji? This is incorrect, a person could be kharidji even if he does not declare disbelief by major sins, Imam Abu al-Hasan al-Ash'ari said: "**They have a consensus – meaning the khawarij factions – that every major sin is disbelief except Al Najdaat because they do not say this**" [127].

Note that the Najdaat faction do not see the disbelief of the major sin but is counted from among the khawarij factions with the consensus of the scholars.

***

- As for the words of Abū Maysarah al-Shāmī: "**Despite the many delusions of Abū Muṣʿab Al-Suri summarized in the following points: - He does not have scholarly manners in presentation, where he gets affected by the military marxist writings, he argues in issues of Tawheed and Jihad in a purely emotional way, and then judges the jihad of the muwahidoon as "failed experiment", forgetting the people of the ditch "Aṣḥāb al-Ukhdūd"!**"

Notice how he said that using the term failure means deviation and misguidance! While Allah says: (And do not dispute (with one another) lest you lose courage (Fatafshaloo → Fashal = failure) and your strenght depart). [Sura Al-Anfaal : 49]

The term "failure" is a shar'i term, it describes an accurate situation , which is defeat and weakness.

Even the usage of Shar'i descriptions became deviation!

As for the case of the people of the ditch, their goal was not fighting and overthrowing a government, for us to say that they were succesful in it or not, rather their case is belief and persistence on it – and the soldiers of the king were killing them and they did not move -, there is a difference between the two images.

The othe issue: Reading from military marxist books and quoting the beneficial from it is no ussue and this is something permissible.

Using the military writings of the disbelievers and adding them to the benefit of the believers is something or Prophet – peace be upon him – did in the Battle of the Trench. The trenches were dug by the suggestion of Salman Al-Farisi because he saw the Persian Majoos dig trenches in their lands for war, so our Prophet – peace be upon him – did it- for what he saw in it of benefit and interest for the believers.

***

[127] Articles of the islamists and the diversity of the worshipers – Page 86.

- in conclusion of this point there are wrong objectog sentences, from among them:.

1) That someone tells you why are you refuting the Islamic State in the middle of this Crusader campaign on them?! Then we say that Allah sent down verses that corrects the mistakes of Sahaba in the middle of battle with the disbeliever! Even our Prophet himself, in the battle of Uhud when his face was wounded and his blood started to flow on his face and his tooth was broken he said: (How can a people who distress their prophet succeed?) Thus Allah sent down guidance to his prophet saying: (You have no concern in the affair whether He turns to them (mercifully) or chastises them, for surely they are unjust.). For the Mujahideen are not better than the prophet nor his companions that they are isolated from being criticized in the middle of battle.

2) If anyone of them tells you : You help the disbelievers knowingly or unknowingly by criticizing The State, then I say: You then have to acknowledge that your State helps the disbelievers knowingly or unknowingly by declaring war on all jihadi factions and fighting the Taliban and Al Qaeda whom are in a war with the U.S!

3) If one of them tells you why do you speak about The State and you don't speak about about so and so faction, then I say do you see me being unjust? Then he will say: yes, then I will reply: Fine, and did you speak about the mistakes of The State like you speak about the others?! Usually the answer will be: No, then do not request of me to do something you don't do yourself! Either we criticize all of them or do not even ask this question, And if this action you call me to is good then do it yourself and be an example for me! And criticize all.

4) If one of them says to you: do you not see that the State fights the disbelievers and applies the shar'i Hudood? Then I say: My disagreement with The State is not in applying the shar'i hudood nor their fighting of the (agreed upon) disbelievers, but my disagreement is in five points like Shaykh abu 'Abdullah Al Mansoor said: "**The basics of our disagreement with them are five issues: Declaring disbelievers without unjustly, and the unjust killing, the lies, the ignorance, and the lack of consideration in shar'i politics in jihadi work**" [128].

And we must know that applying the Shar'i hudood or fighting the disbeliever does not drop the shari' right of transgression, oppression, hostility, declaring disbelief without right. Otherwise tomorrow the hudood are applied and the shari'a has been ruled with and the people have been declared disbelievers and the massacres happen, and then says do not take me accountable because I established shari'a and my establishment of shari'a forgives all my other criminal actions!!!

5) They say, before, they described you as khawaridj while now you and others are describing the Islamic State with what they described you with before which is that you are khawaridj. Then I reply: Before, they described the mujahideen as khawaridj because they fought the Americans and

[128] The Islamic State between reality and delusion – Page 3.

the governments, but now they describe you as khawaridj because you fought and did takfeer on islamic jihadi groups.

<u>Question:</u> Is Shaykh Sulaymān Al-'Ulwān one of the scholars who support the Islamic State?!

<u>The answer:</u> concerning Shaykh Sulaymān Al-'Ulwān, he is an opponent of the State, and he is known and famous, unfortunately he is famous among those close to Shaykh Sulaymān Al-'Ulwān. Like the person who visits him and comes in close contact with them or comes in close contact to those close to him. And earlier a letter arrived to Turkī al-Binʿalī which is still in my archive and was sent by some fanatical supporters of the Islamic State in Saudi Arabia whom are currently all imprisoned. But when this letter was sent there was no fighting between the factions and the State and there is relative freedom in those countries, and this letter originally was a conversation and the in the ending the conclusion was mentioned, the date of this letter is 26 September 2013 in it came:

(**There is an important issue I want to talk about, in the last period I was in Al- Qassim to attend a wedding of one of the brothers, from them Al-'Ulwān and others, and unfortunately the stance of Shaykh Al-'Ulwān on The State is very very bad. The shaykh is met by brothers and other shuyukh a lot, they advise him, but his stance about the State is 10 years old and especially after the death of Abu Mus'ab AlZarqawi. Shaykh Naser Al Thaqeel met with us and 'Ulyawiy Al Shimri and others, they were very angry, because the Shaykh used to be on their atmosphere when they came, bt when they left he would say the opposite of it, his situation is difficult, and he says the deviations are from the time of Abū Muṣʽab al-Zarqāwī, but he used to accept advice, and the deviation was not a general manhaj on the group! And he says according to my sources, naturally angry about the book extending the hands, and he says that in the book was found that whom does not pledge allegiance should be fought, this is their general manhaj in fighting those who do not pledge allegiance. Thus Al-'Ulwān should be kept neutral because satisfying him (ideologically) is very difficult, even I said to him (and do you believe they are infiltrated? Because nothing is left except that) he said: No, then I mentioned in the end, that the State, whatever it reaches of evil in your eyes, they are not worse than the Surooris that you stand with them against us. My intention was to stop him from speaking, and I will send you the five points on which the brothers are gathered whom were present in the meeting, most of them are trustworthy brothers:**

1- The difference with the Islamic State is from 10 years ago, since the death of Abu Mus'ab.

2- Making permissible the blood of those who do not pledge allegiance, and that this is the general manhaj of the group.

3- Killing for benefits.

4- Not accepting advice.

5- Not accepting adjucation (tahkeem) if it does not agree with what they want.

6- They are ignorant.

7- They accuse their opponents with issues and then they apply it.

8- Some judges complained and they want to leave, but they fear being executed.

9- Permissibility of the increase of groups, and gave an example of the defection of Jama'ah "Jund al-Āqsā".

10- Wasting the blood of Abū Mariyah

11- Their killing of 50 ansar.

This is it, there are others as well, but we did not mention them but there was no consensus of the five of us, taking care of the strong conveyance.

In spite of all the evils Al-'Ulwān mentioned, he used to say " this is only a drop in the ocean!" therefor I say the situation is very difficult, the brothers and our shuyukh threw up their hands with him, and some deserted him and many brothers left his lectures). *Ending of the letter*.

Naturally some might doubt the authenticity of this or that it is different or that they are merely lies. For the one that says that I say: I am prepared for a Mubahalah on the authenticity in any time in any form the complainer wants.

But the question: Why did Shaykh Sulaymān Al-'Ulwān not announce his opposition on The State?!

He announced it in a special and closed meeting, but it was not announced publicly because details lack for him to continue giving advice, because if you anounce the details and you speak publicly, then it becomes difficult on you to continue communications with the soldiers of this organization like what previously happened. Firstly an internal attack will happen from inside the group and warning anyone sympathizing with you, and maybe punishment for who contacts you because this person might defect. Therefor some shuyukh delayed in announcing details so that they can extract the maximum amount of people.

They defamed Al-'Ulwān through Abū Maysarah in his article (al-Hazmi between the major sin of staying behind and the misguidance of Al Jaamiyyah) but when narrated that most of the delegates to them are sympathizers with Shaykh Al-'Ulwān and thought that Al-'Ulwān was a supporter of the State and because of that they go to him. I think that they said it was a mistake that their manhaj is public and we lose this fooled party; thus they were silent to attract his students and whom they consider their scholar and their marji' and they thought in the time itself that Al-'Ulwān was a supporter of The State.

The Footnote

Juhayman Al'Utaybi and the Salafi Jihadists.

<u>Question:</u> **Do you consider the Juhayman group a Jihadi group like the currently present Jihadi groups which are known by the (Salafi Jihadi) name specifically because they followed the armed path and opposed the Saudi regime and fought the Saudi nation in a battle that continued for a week in the Holy site of Makkah?**

<u>The answer:</u> The Juhaymān group which stormed the Holy site of Makkah in the year 1979 often the jihadi groups are seen as an extension for this group or that the Juhaymān group floats in the same orbit as the jihadi groups, but this is false, there are many significant and clear differences between the Juhaymān stream and the jihadi stream.

We will mention some points that represent the indication of clear separation between the two methods (manhaj).

1- Juhaymān did not declare the rulers disbelievers, rather he found it sufficient to say that there is no bay'ah to them.

Juhaymān al-'Utaybī said:

(**Many things that were mentioned and described by the Prophet peace be upon him apply to these rulers in the hadith in the chapter before this, and there is no bay'ah to them from the Muslims and they should not obey these rulers, and yet it is not necessary after all this to do takfeer on them**)[129].

Nasser Al-Huzeimi, one of the living remnants of the Juhaymān group said:

(**The house of the Jama'ah used to accommodate to a group of frequent visitors of the city, pilgrims, and violators of the "Accomodation System", most of them were from Egypt, most of those were from Islamic Jama'ah. Later it was clarified to me that some of them were from the Jihad group, and others were from the Takfeer and Hijra group or had a connection with it. And at the time the point which was aroused most was the position of doing takfeer on the ruler, there were long and wide debates between them until they reached the stage of discord and disagreement**). [130]

Takfeer of the contemporary rulers is an agreed upon principle in the jihadi school, when Abū Muṣʿab Al-Suri spoke about commonalities between the jihadi groups, he said:

---

[129] Al-Imarah letter – Page 26.

[130] Days with Juhayman – Page 50/51.

(**All the established regimes in this time are Kufr regimes: firstly: we consider all present regimes in the Islamic world as kufr regimes, and this item is a fundamental item thus the group that does not adopt this saying is not a Jihadi group, secondly: takfeer of the rulers that rule not with what Allah has revealed, with the qur'anic text and the sunnah, all the rulers now are disbelievers**) [131].

Shaykh Ayman al-Zawahiri said:

(**The Mujahideen gather on common fundamentals which are: …….thirdly: Takfeer of the regimes because they rule with other than what Allah revealed**)[132].

The other issue after the takfeer of the ruler is the issue of takfeer of the helpers of the Tawagheet, the Parliamentarians. This was a reason for dispute or Shaykh al-Maqdisī to leave the Juhaymān group, Shaykh Abū Muḥmmad al-Maqdisī said: (**This was also a stage from the stages in which a disagreement happened between us and the group in the initial crystallizing of this issue; the takfeer of the Army and Police, and the Parliaments**)[133].

2- Priority of Jihad

Juhaymān believed that to exercise jihad then we must follow the stage which the Prophet peace be upon him walked, and without that it is impermissible to wage jihad.

For example, firstly Imaan and then Hijrah and after that in the final stage Jihad.

Juhaymān said:

(**The Minhaj giving victory to the religion is summed up in three issues:**

1- To say the truth in the da'wa to tawheed of Allah Almighty, and disavowing shirk and its people, innovation and its people and be hostile in it, and to follow the footsteps of Muhammad peace be upon him and his family.

2- Then harm and ousting from the homes and wealth happens and Hijra happens to a place where they gather.

3- And after that fighting (Jihad) happens.

And here is the proof: (Indeed, those who have believed and those who have emigrated and fought in the cause of Allah – those expect the mercy of Allah. And Allah is Forgiving and Merciful.))[134].

---

131 Constituents of the organization and the role of manhaj – Page 50.
132 Interview with Al-Ansar Magazine, Issue 91, 4 April, 1995.
133 Series: "But rather be men of God" – Third episode.
134 Letter: removing confusion – Page 16.

Whereas Shaykh Abū Muḥmmad al-Maqdisī, who was previously included in the Juhaymān group, said:

(**Even in the issue of Jihad they opposed the issue of fighting and rebelling against the regimes because Juhaymān originally did not declare the disbelief of these regimes, and he had an opinion and held on to this opinion which is that there is no Qitaal (fighting) except after Hijra (emigrating) and they use the following verse as proof: "Indeed, those who have believed and those who have emigrated and fought in the cause of Allah – those expect the mercy of Allah. And Allah is Forgiving and Merciful", and this verse they used as proof on jihad that it is a stage after Imaan, after that Hijra, and after that Qitaal. And that there is no Qitaal before Hijra, you must do Hijra to a place to seek refuge, like the Surah in which the prophet peace be upon him fought, he did not fight except after his Hijra to Madina. And they use these things as proof and made it that the path to victory is following this path literally, that's why they differed with us when we presented the issue of Qitaal and Jihad**)[135].

Shaykh Abū Qatāda said:

(**This was warned about in the issue of the path of da'wa, that it is not allowed for a person to walk the seerah in the same exact circumstances, wanting first to start secretly, then openly, then da'wa and after that hijra! This is a wrong interpretation of the Seerah**)[136].

The Jihadi organizations that were active in the nineties in Egypt, Libya, and Algeria all of them participated directly in Jihad in their countries without walking in accordance to these stages.

If the group does not believe in carrying weapons except after Hijra then why did it carry weapons in the Haram (Mekka)?!

Answer: The event in the Haram carried with it some exception, this after they adopted the issue of (Mahdi), and the prophecy and events of the End Times say that Mahdi will fortify himself in Haram Al Makki and an army will come to kill him and the earth will swallow them when they are on the way. That is why they depended on the issue of fortifying and arming. This because they believed that they were living in the End Times and that the prophecy was applied to them, otherwise in a normal state they do not believe in fighting except after Hijra.

3- Priority of Ijtihad.

Within the guidelines and principles of the Juhaymān group is the adoption of the issue of non-adherance to any madhab of any of the madhahib of Fiqh, and lauching a war against following them, they return directly to the source of Qur'an and Sunnah without the need for schools of Fiqa governing the process of Ijtihad to extract the shar'i verdict, this origin or this broad line is not adopted by jihadi organizations.

---

135 Series: Series "But rather be men of God" – Third episode.
136 Discussions about the book Qadr Al-Da'wa by Sheikh Rifa'ee Suroor.

You see them using the proofs from all four schools of fiqh.

Rather some even went farther than that, Shaykh Abū Yaḥyā al-Lībī advised those who entered Afghanistan (whom follow the Hanafi school): [One should not be predisposed to a specific school nor predisposed to one of the Imams, and avoid belittlement of what was given to them in a fatwa].

However the Juhaymān group waged a war against the madhabs of the Imams, claiming following the proof.

And then said one should not do what differs with the Hanafi madhab in some Sunan, and said: (**Any mujahid should give priority to the interests of the coalition and the assembly on the partial issues which leads to dissonance and disagreement, even if he left some sunan and mustahabbaat fearing to repulse their hearts from the muhajireen and their opinions differ. There is no shar'i complication in leaving the raising of hands before ruku' and after, or leaving the moving of the index finger during tashahhud, or leaving saying ameen loudly, or descending on the knees for prostration rather than on the hands etc etc. Rather leaving all these things is rewarded good deeds if his intention with leaving them was to gather the hearts and pushing away disagreement, and this is the core of Fiqh like Al Bukhari titled one of his chapters about nullifying Al Ka'bah with his saying: (Chapter of leaving some choice fearing the lack of understanding of some people and them falling in something worse)**)[137].

And one of the most influential members of the Juhaymān group was Shaykh Badee' Al-Deen Ibn Ihsaan Allah Shah Al-Rashidee Al-Sindee (**The Shaykh forbade studying the local book by Ibn Hazm because they attacked the four Madhabs, especially the Hanafi madhab, and next to the course of Shaykh Badee' there was another course for the students of knowledge from Bukhara studying the Hanafi Madhab, the Shaykh tried to make them hear what they hate which was of distaste and lack of manners, until he called them semi-men, and what was most repeated by him saying while turning to them was: Look at these semi-men, they leave the hadith of the Messenger for the opinions of men**)[138].

He means that some that affiliate themselves to the four Islamic madhahib imitate the ijtihaad of their scholars in the madhab and rely on it, regardless of the extent of their conformity with shar'i proof, and their argument is that our level of understanding does not let us consider between the proofs and we leave this to the scholars and we follow them in what they reached of Ijtihad. The Juhayman group and several scholars that were affected by the manhaj of Ibn Hazm (Ẓāhirī manhaj) and Shaykh al-Albani as well oppose following the quotes of the scholars of the four madhabs and leave the proof because the proof has priority to be followed and not the quotes of men.

Therefor the Juhaymān group composed a letter with the name (Statement and details in the necessity of knowing the proof).

[137] Advise for the Mujahideen entering Afghanistan – Page 2.
[138] Days with Juhayman – Page 33.

4- (truthful) Dream and Mahdi.

The belief of the Juhaymān group that “Muḥammad b. ʿAbdAllāh al-Qaḥṭānī” was the awaited Mahdi mentioned in the books of Ahadith whom appears at the end times and rids the Ummah of oppression, does not represent a separation between the Jihadi groups only, rather it represents a separation with all parts, sects, and islamic movements including parts within the Juhaymān group itself.

Shaykh Atiyyatullah Al-Libi said: (**In reality my knowledge about the situation of Shaykh Juhaymān al-’Utaybī may Allah have mercy on him is little. And the small portion that I saw from his booklets seem good, filled with tawheed and sunnah and religion strength , and what is in it of mistakes is like the mistakes of the rest of the people, what is apparent is that he was a religious person, but a fitna happened to him and his companionns, which is known as the fitna of the holy site of Makkah year 1400 hijri**)[139].

The reason that they believed that Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Qaḥṭānī was the mahdi was because dreams about him being the mahdi was widespread!

It is known that the dreams a person sees are not used to build plans or strategies or shar'i rulings, Abū Muṣʿab Al-Suri said: (**Some want to drop visions and dreams related to events and people, sons of Malahem and Fitan on some people – such as Mahdi and others – so now there are stories about the possibility of more than one Mahdi in several places, and I want to remind the brothers: read the understanding of the Salaf about the issue of visions and dreams and the types and specifications. And the difference between them and hadith nafs (dreaming about what happened in your day for example)...not to mention the dreams of demons that do not necessarily have to be frightening nightmares but the devil may cast illusions and exaggerations and concepts and assumptions to make the person seeing the dream take it as revelation or makes a decision in an issue or a person. Or a devil might make it – if it was an amateur planning in the future in the light of dreams and visions – and took a wrong direction, what could happen to him; or someone near him; frightening nightmares, but in the real world**)[140].

Imam Al-Bahooti Al-Hanbali says:

(**It is known that religious laws are not established based on dreams seen in sleep but they (dreams) are used in a frivolous manner**)[141].

Meaning that nobody can say this is Halal or Haram or this is Wajib or not Wajib built on a dream he saw, and he can't say to anyone that this person is a murtad or kafir because he saw in a dream committing kufr!

139 Answers of the Hisbah – Page 262.
140 Visions and dreams, or wishes ans fantasies? - Page 4.
141 Kashf al-Qinaa': 14/314.

Because all religious verdicts are not taken from dreams, rather with what happened with a person when awake from one side and what is established in the Qur'an and Sunnah from the other.

Naturally these four points might form the greatest points of difference, and without doubt there are other points but maybe only partial.

***

In the end, one of the best books published in the English language speaking about the Juhaymān event are (The Meccan Rebellion) by the author Thomas Hegghammer and Stephane Lecroix.

As for in the Arabic language then review the book (Days with Juhayman) by Nasser Al-Huzeimi and the second and third episode in the personal history of Shaykh Abū Muḥmmad al-Maqdisī (But rather be men of God) and there is also a documentary produced by the Arabic BBC channel titled (The Siege of Mecca) which contains important witnesses.

This is it and Allah is All knowing.

A refutation on the ISIS claim of Jabhat Nusra's apostasy.

Question: What is your opinion on the Islamic State applying takfeer on Jabhat Nusra because they:

• Allegedly supported the apostates and the sahawāt against them.

• They do not rule by Shari'a and are present in courts that rule with non-Islamic laws?

The answer:

Firstly, I will refute the doubt on "supporting the apostates" and then I will address the remaining issues as there are older cases and events in which the so-called Islamic State and their supporters declared the disbelief of Jabhat Nusra. We will discuss these issues one by one.

* * *

1. Regarding what happened in the eastern areas of Syria, some say that Al Nusra supported the apostates, (whom Joulani himself labelled as having fallen into disbelief).

Abu Muhammad Joulani said: "We do not deny that there are groups fighting you which have fallen in apostasy and disbelief. Eg. Arkan and Itilaf and those that are establishing the national army project whom wish to establish a secular government and destroy the guided Islamic Project"[142]

The supporters of the Islamic State published during the infighting in the eastern areas a recording of one of the arkan or itilaf commanders on Al Jazeerah channel -I do not remember- and claimed it to be proof of support and reason of disbelief. When I watched the recording, I saw that he didn't admit to supporting Nusra in their fight against Dawla, rather he said that all the factions in the eastern region fought them - and this is correct. Being that all factions were fighting them, does not necessarily imply that there is coordination and support. Likewise, for us to say that all factions in Syria are fighting the Syrian regime, does this mean that there is coordination and support between all these factions?! The answer is no. The factions in Idlib and Aleppo fought the Islamic State without coordination between them, and so did the factions in the eastern region! But (in Dawla) there is an obsession for takfeer.

At times, the Islamic State attacks an area collectively, each rebel faction defends and tries to stop Dawla's attacks separately. This is referred to as synchronization or collective defense. Abū Abdullah al-Shāmī said: (**We do not ally nor coordinate with the puppets of America, the likes of the Itilaf party or Arkan. If fighting and repelling the Dawlah group occurs at the same time some of the puppet groups fight -be they Arab or western- , that does not concern us, and it is not**

[142] Speech: Laytak Rathaytani, February 2014.

classed as mudhaharah (support). We are defending ourselves from the aggression of that group. Synchronisation is one thing and support is something els)[143].

Jabhat Nusra then published a statement on the tenth of February 2014 titled (Fatabayanū) in which they refuted the same doubt. It stated:

(**As for what is rumored about us, that we co-ordinated with the criminals and the agents in our fight with the "Dawla" group, this is a clear lie and those who accuse us with such thing must bring proof. Finally, we do not take support from those who are at war with the religion of Allah, from the disbelievers and their agents to take back our usurped rights from those who transgressed against us. We have continuously announced our disassociation from the people of shirk and secularism and shown enmity to all corrupt and misguided regimes, and Allah is A witness upon what we say**)[144].

I remember two tweets, one of them for a head shar'i in the eastern region, alive and well today "Zubayr Al-Ghazzi". He tweeted: "I heard that some claim that we co-ordinate with the kufri majlis in our fight against the Dawla group. This is totally fabricated lie".

Zubayr Al-Ghazzi was in the rural region of Deir EzZor, as for the other brother who's name is Talha Al-Madani (who was imprisoned by the Dawla shortly after), was in the city of Deir. he had said: "By Allah and I swear by Allah, if I saw that Nusra fought with the Majlis Askari against the State, I would have left and abandoned them".

When you collaborate and coordinate with a side you obviously won't provoke them and throw out accusations of disbelief and betrayal at them! Is it logical for Nusra to collaborate with Itilaf and Arkan in the eastern region while one of it's head Shar'is in the eastern region says that it is a Majlis kufri?!

Also, when another member swears that if he saw his group fighting (in collaboration) then he would abandon them, and he did not, rather he fought with his group until he was imprisoned by the Dawla?!

Sultan Al'Utowi a Nusra defector in the eastern region said in his book which covered the events in the eastern region: (**Basha'ir Al-Nusrah faction and Kata'ib Sh'aytaat denied being subordinate to the military council. This is what I knew and what was known in the area too, that there is no faction belonging to the military council except for kata'ib Muhsin which later pledged allegiance to the Dawlah as i will mention soon**).[145]

During his speech on the remaining events, the Muhsin area in which these kata'ib were present, was not mentioned except when it was attacked! Even before it would pledge allegiance to dawla!!!

---

143 Litubayninannahu lilnas, wa la taktumunah, March 2014.
144 Statement: Fatabayyanu by Jabhat Nusra (Deir EzZor area), 10 February 2014.
145 Min wahy alinsihabat – page 20.

For example his quote: ("**The important thing is that they sent the Free Syrian Army to me and told me these kata'ib are all under your command, and all of them will raise the banner of Jabha, we want you to lead the attack on Muhsin, so I told them muhsin didn't pledge to I.S. rather they wanted to stay neutral, so should we attack them?! Those that attacked are the Sh'aytaat, the FSA, and individuals from JN after coordination with the command of the tribes of JN, but what had happened? The people of Muhsin repelled and I.S. took advantage of the event and entered to support Muhsin, and like this large numbers of the Sh'aytaat tribe and those with them were killed. I.S. then took complete control over Muhsin**")[146].

This is proof that even before the military council pledged to I.S, the relations between JN and their supporters from the military council were not well – those that pledged to I.S soon after – so how can they accuse them of supporting and aiding the apostates against I.S?!

In the words of Al'Utwi there is another proof that kata'ib Muhsin, who were a memeber of the military council wanted to stay neutral and not get involved in the struggle between Nusra and Dawla!

These are rational arguments that prove the absence of coordination.

* * *

2. The Majlis Shura of Mujahideen in the eastern region which included Jabhat Nusra and other groups, had allegedly included apostates from Hay'at AlArkan and Itilaf.

Majlis Shura Al-Mujahideen in the eastern region itself published a statement saying: (**we clarify that Majlis Shura Al-Mujahideen has no relation whatsoever with the Syrian Itilaf or Hay'at Al-Arkan and it's likes**).[147]

But for the sake of argument, I will concede that they included some apostate groups! The military leadership to this majlis was headed by Al-Nusra and they had the upper hand in it.

I read a tweet by Turkī al-Binʿalī in which he differentiates between the issue of Isti'anah and Mudhāharah by the upper hand and flag [148]. If the leadership was for the Muslims then it is isti'anah "which is in fact an issue the scholars have differed on, some classifying it as permissible and others as prohibited. However, none of them labelled it as disbelief".

---

146 Min Wahy Al-Insihabaat – Page 50.
147 The Third Statement, 1 June 2014.
148 Mentioned in a research by the office of research and study of the Islamic State: (The difference between I'anah and Isti'anah, Isti'anah is when a group that is affiliated with Islam requests help from the disbelievers; either they ask their help in fighting other Muslims or disbelievers, and as for I'anah it is when a group that is affiliated with Islam offer help to the disbelievers, either they offer help to fight other Muslims or disbelievers, and every issue has its specific shar'i ruling, it is not allowed to mix between these issues or to confine them all in one box). [Al-Ibanah fi Suwar Al-Isti'anah wa Al-I'anah – Page 5-6].

If the leadership was for the apostates then it would have been clear apostasy. However, the military leadership was for Al Nusra and they are the upper hand in it. Therefore, this issue is classed as in issue of ijitihad and not I'tiqad! It lies between impermissibility and permissibility according to the conditions, and not between disbelief and belief!

That is if we conced for the sake of argument that some factions were apostates. Otherwise, their original ruling is Islam and they disassociate themselves from Itilaf and Arkan.

* * *

3. Quoting the defectors as proof by saying that so-and-so have fallen into disbelief and the proof is "what the defector said about so and so".

I personally do not accept nor reject these testimonies, because there are several possibilities which are based on taking revenge on the ex-group as a result of disagreements between them, As well as the possibility that they may have been forced to deliver certain messages from the side recently joined to the ex-side and so on.

If we wanted to apply the same logic, we would find that the '"Dawla" has committed disbelief built on the testimonies of the defectors!

The defector Abd Al-Raheem Muslim Dost Al Afghani, an ex-prisoner in Guantanamo said after his defection: (**O Gentlemen: How can you justify the transgressions of your commander Sa'eed Khan with the Afghan people in Kot and Shinwari? And now Lashkar-e-Taiba, attached to the Pakistani intelligence ISI, send your commander material support under the name of donations through a "press of a button" by Abu Bakr and Hafidh Sa'eed Khan who kill the Afghan people with the granted support**)[149].

* * *

4. Liwa Thuwar Al Raqqah, (affiliated with Al Nusra), fought alongside the Atheist Kurds from the PKK in Raqqah against Dawla.

This is only a fraction of the scene. Was this fight with the knowledge and support of the leadership of Nusra?! The answer is no, because Al-Nusra released a statement saying:

(**More than six months ago in the city of Raqqah the group "Liwa Thuwar Al Raqqah" joined us, and showed interest in entering religious courses, and abiding the fixed rules of Jabhat Nusra. Both sides slacked in carrying out this agreement:**

From the side of Jabhat Nusra: the slack was in holding qualitative and quantitative religious sessions.

---

[149] A message to the indifferent – Page 1.

From the side of Liwa Thuwar Al Raqqah: The slack was in their commitment with the fixed rules of Jabhat Nusra.

After the assaults from the Dawla group in Raqqah against the mujahid factions and the infighting started, the Liwa retreated from Raqqah to the neighboring areas, and since then, communications stopped.

Upon that, Jabhat Nusra announced the break of all organizational ties between them and liwa' thuwar Al Raqqah)[150]

After the infighting happened and the organizational communications had stopped; meaning that Jabhat Nusra had no knowledge of what had happened afterwards nor was it under their consent. Nusra was not pleased when the actions of Liwa Thuwar Al-Raqqah expanded (breaking their commitment to the fixed rules) and did not see their actions to be from the reasonable issues or even considered as insignificant rather they expelled the faction from the Nusra organization!

If Nusra genuinely supported the fighting alongside the PKK and perceived it to be reasonable, then why did they take these measures?!

* * *

5. The fight with Jamal Ma'rouf, member of the Arkan organization! And the citing of a clip recorded in the beginning of the events in Idlib back in 2014, where he states that Jabhat Nusra is fighting with his group against Dawla.

I say in refutation: the words of Jamal Ma'rouf can only imply that he was trying to escalate the pattern of war. This is the work of the intelligence agencies. Ma'rouf saw that his statement perfectly fitted for this job.

Moreover, a while after Jamal Ma'rouf retracted from his statement on the co-operation with Al Qaeda, as mentioned in the Turkish Anadolu agency: (**The militia leader of "Jabhat Thuwar Suria" ; Jamal Ma'rouf said there is no cooperation between his forces and "Jabhat Nusra" - the Al Qaeda affiliate in Syria, and that he is against 'Al Qaeda and all its forms of extremism', denying any cooperation between his forces and 'Jabhat Nusra' in Syria**)[151] and refuting the allegations made against him.

Secondly: Soldiers of Dawla confirmed the lies of Jamal Ma'rouf! His videoclip was released in January 2014, the same month the soldiers of Dawla tweeted the hashtags:

•(#clashes_between_Jabha_and_apostates_Jamal_Ma'rouf | #اشتباكات_بين_الجبهة_ومرتدين_جمال_معروف)

---

150 Statement: (Statement and clarification concerning "Liwa' Thuwar AlRaqqah") 16/4/2014.
151 Anadolu Agency Turkey, 7 April 2014.

•(#Sahawaat_betray_Jabhat_Nusra | #الصحوات_تغدر_بجبهة_النصرة). The one who started these hashtags was a soldier of Dawla named Abu Asef Al-Qatari and by Sahawaat he meant Jamal Ma'rouf's goup.

An Islamic State reporter; Abu Al'Abbas Al-Libi, tweeted on 9/2/2014: ("**Breaking News, clashes between Jabhat Nusra and Jamal Ma'rouf in Idlib, the news is verified**")!

Hamam Al-aseeri, another IS soldier tweeted on 24/1/2017: "**The brothers in Jabhat Nusra informed us that today in Idlib Jamal Ma'rouf was preparing to fight them**..."

All these testimonies from the Dawla itself confirm the lies of Jamal Ma'rouf when he said that Jabhat Nusra cooperates with him against the Dawl. Also, the testimonies of the soldiers of the Dawla themselves affirm that Jamal Ma'rouf's group fought and betrayed Jabhat Nusra.

We have two options. Either Jamal Ma'rouf is lying or the soldiers of Dawla are lying!

After the voice recording of Abu Muhammad Al-Amriki was released, in which he said that Jabhat Nusra cooperated with Ma'rouf in Atmeh, Abu Sulayman Al-muhajir refuted him in a voice recording titled: (Fatabayyano) and demolished his claims.

Shaykh Abu Muhammad Al-Joulani was asked in his first interview: "rumours spread about you that you coordinated with Jamal Ma'rouf during his fight against the Dawla Group, and that you allowed the transfer of weapons and convoys for him. How accurate is this?

He answered: (**Subhanallah! This is a great libel propagandized against us by our opposition. Jabhat Nusra was established on constants, from which is the fact that we do not fight "willingly" with any suspisious group. When I say "willingly" I mean when we have a chlive in options like in an offensive operation. While in sudden defensive operations sometimes there are no options; like a sudden advance from the regime for example on an area which we control, all people will go out and fight, this is called a synchronized fight.**

As for the event of Atmeh, it has been propagandized against us many times, to summarise what happened; this area (Atmeh) was open for everyone, and there was a great number of factions, including the Dawla group which had a delegation there. These convoys carrying weapons and ammunition used to enter and they knew where these weapons and ammunition were headed. When the turmoil and infighting occured between the Dawla group and the other factions, Jabhat Nusra took a neutral position as a peacemaker and started protecting the families of the mujahireen that were either besieged or pressured and were gathered in Atmeh. The brothers there did their best trying to avoid entering this gathering in which the new struggle started with these factions, because the war was raging and becoming more intense. Likewise, they strived because we had a weak presence in the areas of those factions, so any clash here will weaken us in the other areas and revenge will be taken on our brothers in the other areas. As for me personally, I did not know about this issue except after it happened and unlike what was said, I

didn't command this, however, when I heard about it, I said that no weapons will pass in this time to anyone if we have the ability to stop it)[152].

* * *

Some tend to take the proof of their friends present in Syria whom have joined the Islamic State, and depend on their sayings and testimonies against their opposition. Let me apply the same logic of the leader of the state!

al 'Adnānī said" (**And if you ask one of them how did you judge? He would say: A trustworthy person told me, Subhanallah! Even if that trustworthy person is our rival?**)[153]. The one you consider trustworthy and is also on the field (of battle) his testimony is not accepted against his rival, this is what your commander says! So allow me to apply his principle.

* * *

6. Regarding what happened in Dar'aa of infighting between Jabhat Nusra and Jaysh Yarmook (which soon after changed to Jaysh Khaled and was affiliated with Dawla) and the statement of some that Nusra cooperated with the stooge MOC-factions in fighting this group.

This is indeed a laughable matter, because the MOC-factions published a statement when the fighting happened between the two parties. They said: "**in order to protect the blood of the mujahideen, and shield it from the fitna and to remove the constrictions between the brothers from both sides of the conflict in the area of Hawran and Quneitra, we the operating factions in both areas appeal and call upon everyone that has jealousy towards the blood of the Muslims to stop today and to move towards stopping the fighting**"[154].

This is proof that the foreign affiliated MOC-factions took the position of the onlooker and did not cooperate in the fight. Therfore, how can it be said that Jabhat Nusra fought with the MOC-factions?

* * *

7. The alliance between Jabhat Nusra and Islamic Factions of which The Islamic State says their leaders committed apostasy. It must be clarified that the apostasy of the leaders of Islamic groups and their disbelief does not necessarily mean that their soldiers are disbelievers until the proof has been established upon their soldiers and the ignorance of their soldiers is removed, according to what The Islamic State itself mentioned in it's Dabiq magazine:

" **al-Zhawāhirī differentiates between a party and its individual members when it comes to the label of kufr and some of its rulings. This differentiation goes against the consensus of the Salaf**

152 First audio-interview with Shaykh Abu Muhammad Al-Joulani, November 2014.
153 Speech: (Let us supplicate, and let the curse of Allah be upon the liars) 30 April 2015.
154 Statement published by Jabhat Janubiyyah (Southern Front), 30 April 2015.

concerning parties that are based on kufr. However, if the apostasy emerges within the leadership of a Muslim party that was originally formed for a legitimate purpose, such as jihād in the cause of Allah, then the differentiation might have a correct basis initially until the proof can be established on the followers (who remained ignorant of the leadership's condition after it had changed' [155].

* * *

8. The cooperation of Jabhat Nusra with the MOC-factions in rural North Aleppo.

This doubt has been refuted by Shaykh Abū Abdullah al-Shāmī in an official interview where he said: "**There is a front of Ribat between Jabhat Nusra and between the factions that spans between 40 and 50 kilometers. Jabhat Nusra used to have ribat on 5 to 7 kilometers of this front, and it did not join any operations room with the factions that are sponsored by MOC or others, but we preserved our points of ribat responding to the hostility and violence of the Dawla group**"[156].

The shaykh says that there was a frontline of ribat of 5-7 kilometers on which Jabhat Nusra operated alone. The rest of the frontline was operated by the remaining factions. They refused to enter in any cooperative operation not with the factions sponsored by MOC nor any other entity! And it is known by those following the events at the time that Jabhat Nusra was militarily independent especially in those areas.

* * *

9. Jabhat Nusra was present in the court of Justice in Dar'aa which ruled with (The Unified Arab Code):

An official statement from Jabhat Nusra mentioned: "**Jabhat Nusra had suspended its operation in the court of justice in Hawran since nearly six months and withdrew their judges and their security agents from this court before the release of the last statement by the court of justice and before they applied the Unified Arab Code, and that Jabhat Nusra was not consulted nor did it order this statement and does not accept applying this law**"[157].

* * *

10. Jabhat Nusra did not rule by Shari'a (meaning that they didn't apply the punishments): This point needs a long discussion, but for the sake of discussion we will concede that not applying the hudud is disbelief in any situation, and that even in dar harb you have to carry out the hudūd, and that not applying the hudud is not applying the shari'ah and that this is disbelief, we will assume that this is all correct!!!

---

[155] Dabiq Magazine, sixth issue, Page 20.
[156] Interview with Al-manarah Al-Baydaa, September 2015.
[157] Statement regarding adopting the Unified Arab Code in the court of justice in Hawran, 1 November 2015.

By this logic, the Islamic State and it's leaders have fallen into disbelief as well! Because Jabhat Nusra entered the Syrian revolution at the end of 2012 and continued in liberating and controlling areas during 2013 with other factions and did not apply the hudud. someone could say that this all happened without the knowledge of the leadership of the Islamic State like Al-Baghadi and the people he appointed!

We say in reply that this is incorrect, al-Binʿalī said: "**Shaykh Abū Bakr al-Baghdadi sent a number of those keeping track of the work; among them his deputy Shaykh Abu Abdullah – whom was Joulanis Shaykh in prison - and Joulani pushed him away– like he used to do to the predecessors from Iraq-, then the shaykh sent Abu Anas Al'Iraqi – the Dawla shar'i-, when he stayed there for a week he sent to Shaykh Abu Bakr: "Take heed for yourself, for I do not see him except that he will do like Salahudin did with Nur Aldin"! When the issue became more difficult, Shaykh Abū Bakr sent Abū Muḥammad al 'Adnānī to keep track of the work and ordered him to go under the command of Joulani! Joulani was annoyed by Shaykh al 'Adnānī because he would let nothing pass, and complained to the shaykh Abū Bakr about shaykh al 'Adnānī to hear and obey**"[158].

Notice that al 'Adnānī did not miss anything and used to constantly send messages to Abū Bakr al-Baghdadi what he sees and witnesses, and Al-Baghdadi in turn told him to hear and obey!

When did al 'Adnānī arrive? Abū Abdullah al-Shāmī said that he arrived before the battle of Taftanaz airport meaning before January 2013, and before that Abu 'Ali Al-Anbari sent and started "**He wandered around for six months in the east and north and did not leave any guesthouse nor base except that he entered it**". [159]

Meaning that al 'Adnānī was corresponding everything he saw, keeping track of it and was the supervisor over all of the northern areas and before him al 'Adnānī used to wander around in the guesthouses, areas, and bases in the north-east areas and they used to correspond with al-Baghdadi. Did they forget to mention that Jabha did not apply the shar'i hudud? Or was the issue not important anyway therefore it wasn't worth mentioning?

After all of these messages, Al Baghdadi himself went to Syria as al-Binʿalī mentioned: "Shaykh Al Baghdadi came himself and met Joulani, Joulani was afraid that the carpet would be pulled from under his feet! So he complained little by little, when the Shaykh took the hint, he reassured him and said: "Rest assured oh Abu Muhammad, for when 'Umar ibn Al Khattab came – and he was the ameer almu'mineen – to Syria, in which Abū 'Ubaidah ibn al-Jarrāḥ was ruling, he descended under the authority of Abū 'Ubaidah!!".

Despite the fact that Joulani – did not apply the shar'i hudud – and despite that the superiors, commanders, and pillars of the Islamic State like 'al 'Adnānī and Al Anbari used to constantly

---

158 Letter to al-Binʿalī written by Shaykh 'Abdullah Al-Hasani in his book (AlSawa'iq AlHusayniyah Fi Dahd AlIstidlalat AlManamiyah).

159 Details of that time was mentioned by Abu 'Abdullah Al Shami in his book "Dawhah Al jihad" Page 189 and after.

correspond every small and big detail about what happened, and despite that Al Baghdadi came and descended under Joulani and considered him like the companion Abū 'Ubaidah ibn al-Jarrāḥ under whom ‘Umar ibn Al Khattab descended under!!!!

Meaning that they didn’t consider him a disbeliever and approved what he was on, and Baghdadi descended under him!!! When the dispute happened we suddenly discovered the lack of establishing the hudud, means not establishing the shari’a and therefore it is disbelief!!

Baghdadi's approval on what Joulani is on and considering him like Abū 'Ubaidah ibn al-Jarrāḥ and not considering him a disbeliever despite that he didn’t establish the hudud, this means that Baghdadi and his group were pleased with the disbelief – according to their view – which is not establishing the shar’i hudud!!!

By this logic they must apply takfeer on themselves and disassociate themselves from this action to begin with before accusing others of becoming apostates for not applying the shar’i hudud!!

This is a clear proof that they use these shari’a rulings only for their personal benefits. They didn’t give it any importance when Joulani was under their banner and they approved of him and worked under him, however, they discovered this action to ne disbelief after they had a dispute with him!!!

* * *

In this treatise, I respond to old issues which the Islamic State based their declaration of disbelief on Jabhat Nusra. I did not deal with the new issues because initially a part of this answer was a message to one of them and the other part was included in a written debate with a supporter of Dawla, so I presented the doubt and wrote the refutation after formulating them.

The aim of these answers is to refute the extremism in takfeer and show how they jump over the facts of shariah and legitimacy to declare their opposers as disbelievers and to make the fimal decision in the matter of dispute. The legitimacy of their opposers can’t be invalidated unlezs they consider them disbelievers. Therefore, destroying their shar’i legitimacy in the eyes of their supporters and in the eyes of their own supporters by applying takfeer on them, regardless of the takfeer being built on a correct foundation or not, the important thing to them is just tone apply the ruling.

This gives you a sense of understanding on how they deal with shar’i issues and their consequences of blood etc, and how they utilise takfeer for their own political benefit. what was yesterday enjoined becomes disbelief because of a dispute. It also gives you a perception of the major extent to which they have between “theory” and “application”. Their sayings about takfeer are theoretical, that it is not allowed to declare a person as a disbeliever until it's confirmed that he committed the act of disbelief. Rather a person is declared a disbeliever even if his committed act was not confirmed!!!

We are now in a phase which can be categoriesd as “post-dawla”. Perhaps words like these do not have any major effect except if it was to be published at the time. Perhaps also the publication is considered an intellectual luxury. However, I decided to publish it for the sake of it becoming a historical testimony from which the next generation could take benefit - The next generation which could be the generation of establishment - from the mistakes of the previous generation, and praise be to Allah Lord of the worlds.

Shaykh 'Ali AlKhudayr and the Taliban

Some beloved brothers sent me an article to review a quotation I put in my book (Methodological Difference Between ISIS and Al Qaida) by Shaykh ‘Ali AlKhudayr, and said that I had misrepresented a fatwa and its answer and content.

But before we release the question and answer we will address some thing first.

The objector said: (*This was in trying to “prove” that the individual members of the tāifah mumtani’ah (the taifah mumtani’ah) is not made takfīr on and that the Islamic State was wrong to narrate an ijmā’ on the fact that there is no difference between the group and its members*).

Firstly: It is not me that tried to prove that the ijma’ is not set, rather it is the Shaykh that you claimed had sworn his allegiance to you, which is the Shaykh Naser Al-Fahd who confirmed it and said:

(**And know that Sheikhul Islam has not mentioned the consensus of the jurists regarding their Kufr, rather he has mentioned the consensus regarding fighting them. As for the Sahaba then he has mentioned in several places that they are in agreement that they are apostates, however this came by way of interpretations after analyzing the causes, not by a clear text from the Sahaba. So the issue which the Sahaba had agreed upon clearly and in practice - which is fighting- has no disagreement amongst the jurists over it. As for the reason for this fighting and its cause, then it is not clear as has been mentioned previously, and thus they differed with regards to it. And due to this, it cannot be said that the one who does not make Takfeer on them has contradicted the Ijmaa**)[160].

Shaykh Naser Al-Fahd here is pointing to the words of Ibn Taymiyyah: (and like that they refused Zakah, thus aṣ-Ṣiddīq and the companions started fighting them, and they fought them if they refused the wajibat even if they acknowledged them, the fuqaha disputed about the disbelief of those that refused it (Zakah) and fought the Imam (leader) for it with acknowledging its obligation? There are two opinions, both are narrations from Ahmad).

The person that was put in charge over the Reseach office (Maktab Al Buhooth) in your “State”, Turkī al-Binʿalī, who relayed one of the narrations of Imam Ahmad in his message to the negotiation committee, which was relayed from him by Ibn Qudamah: (**The second opinion: They do not disbelieve; because the companions may Allah be pleased with them abstained from fighting the rejecters of Zakah initially; this proves that they did not deem them disbelievers, then they agreed on fighting and kufr remained originally on negation**)[161].

[160] Fatwas from Al Hayer (prison), page 28.
[161] Al Kafi fi fiqh AlImam Ahmad (379/1).

Ibn Qudamah then commented: (it's possible that they were murtaddeen, and it's possible that they denied the obligation of Zakah, and it's possible that it's something else; thus judging with it is not allowed in an area of dispute).

So he was not able to determine which category the rejecters of Zakah were in, are they apostates or are they something else, and he described it as a disputable matter!

And even if Ibn Taymiyyah considered that they were apostates or that they are an apostate faction, however there is a dispute and disagreement between the scholars in the takfeer of the rejecters of Zakah, and there is no consensus (on this)!

Therefor it is not me that tried to prove that there is no consensus, rather it's your scholars which you claim affiliation with, so aim your arrows at their direction not to me! It is your scholars that decided what you see as false and if others spoke about this you would contradict them and not your scholars!

And it's not only them that claimed this, rather even Abū Yaḥyā al-Lībī, on whose path al 'Adnānī claimed to walk in his speech (Apologies leader of Al Qaeda) for Shaykh Abū Yaḥyā al-Lībī said: (**there is no relation in the consensus of the scholars in fighting the factions that abstained from the apparent recurrent Islamic laws by the disagreement in the issue of takfeer of these factions or none, so that some attempt to make the two issues one, and one issue would be joined with the other**)[162], he also said: (**which is that there is completely no inseparability between the obligation of these factions and between the takfeer on them, for leaving one of the apparent recurrent Islamic law and abstention from it does not necessitate the takfeer of the person in every case**)[163].

This is the saying that your official spokesman claims to follow his manhaj!

Secondly: When I spoke about the taifah mumtani'ah in my book (Methodological difference between ISIS and Al Qaida) my goal was not only to prove that there is no consensus, rather to remove a stereotyped image which is that every faction abstained meaning that they committed disbelief.

That is why I relayed this saying: (In fact one of the Imams of the Najdi Dawah Sheikh Abdullah Abu Batheen said "If a group abstained from any of the symbols of Islam, then they should be fought, even if they are not Kuffar or Mushrikeen and their land is the land of Islam".).

And all of my quotes in this part from the book revolve around one of the two issues or both of them.

[162] Al Jihad wa ma'rakat Al Shubuhat – Page 30.
[163] Daf' al malaam 'an mujahidin Maghrib Al Islam – Page 21.

But how do we distinguish the taifah mumtani’ah which is being fought the fight of apostasy from others? The answer: by the type of abstaining, on what issue did they abstain? Would it be disbelief if they abstained from this issue or not?!

Shaykh Abu Qatadah said: (**Therefor the party that sees taifah mumtani’ah as disbelievers solely for their abstainment without looking at the type of gathering which they gathered upon, and this is a mistake. Because the apostates are taifah mumtani’ah if their gathering was with force and weapons and they are apostates for gathering on an issue of disbelief and with it they committed apostasy. Therefor those that abandon adhan (call of prayer) are a taifah mumtani’ah however they are not disbelievers for gathering on an issue which is not disbelief**)[164].

Therefor Ibn Qudamah went to the saying that those who leave one of the branches of religion is not declared a disbeliever for merely leaving it even if they fought and abstained[165].

Thirdly: Those that have basic knowledge of Uṣūl al-fiqh could have ended this issue from the beginning and said: The ijtihad of the contemporary cannot contradict the consensus of the companions! So justifying with the words of Shaykh Al Khudayr is invalid, but because the owner of the article ignorant in Uṣūl al-fiqh he did not pay attention to this point.

* * *

Now we will start on questions and answers:

The questioner asks: “If you find a taifah mumtani’ah and in it kufr is spreading like ruling of the taghoot and ruling by the taghoot, are they all declared apparent disbelievers or are they separated according to their obstacles and reasons”.

When you say that immorality is spreading between the people of the royal palace is everyone then considered immoral, what do you understand from the word “everyone” in this context? You will understand that it returns to “the people of the royal palace” so the sentence becomes “ Does everyone in the royal palace become immoral”?!

Because you limited the side that you are going to speak about in the beginning, so automatically no irrelevant additions can be made!

The questioner here is speaking about the spreading of disbelief between individuals from “taifah mumtani’ah ”, and the word “spreading” does not necessarily mean that everyone is doing kufr. For example to say that adultery has spread in one of the cities, can you then say that every woman in that city are adulteresses?! The answer: No, because the word spreading is not certain proof that this action is committed by everyone.

---

[164] Al-Ajwibah Al’Umariyah Al-As’ilah Al-Homsiyah – Page 4.

[165] Read chapter: (chapter abstaining from Zakah while believing its obligation) from his book :Al Mughni.

And from here we understand the mistake of the objectors translation of the question which is: (There appears a taifah mumtani'ah that spreads kufr).

There is a difference between (within it kufr is spreading) and (is spreading kufr) for in the second sentence it is as if there is an agreement to commit kufr rather even spreading it! As for the first correct sentence does not mean that everyone commits kufr but it's an issue spreading within them!

And there is no indication in this question that this taifah mumtani'ah has abstained from something that is mukfir!

So the answer of the Shaykh 'Ali Al Khudayr: (**It is not allowed to declare all of them disbelievers rather this is the madhab of the khawaridj which is generalized takfeer**).

Why is it not allowed to make takfeer on everyone and is it the madhab of the khawaridj?!

Because you declared everyone that did the kufr action and those that didn't a kafir, the saying (is spreading among them) does not mean that everyone committed kufr, so you declared upon everyone that they are disbelievers despite that the action was not committed by everyone, and declaring takfeer on an action that is not mukfir is the madhab of the khawaridj.

What image is similar to this reality?!

Shaykh 'Ali Al Khudayr continues: (**or declaring the people kuffaar if the ruler committed kufr**).

If you declared everyone a kafir because some of them did something mukfir, you would resemble the khawaridj that declared the people kuffar if the ruler committed kufr, so you took those that did not commit the act of kufr with those that did!

The interesting topic is that The Islamic State became upon the manhaj of the khawaridj at one time according to the fatwa of Shaykh 'Ali Al Khudayr, for they published a statement named (Liyahlika man halaka 'an bayinnah/ that those who perished [through disbelief] would perish upon evidence) in it they said: (and from them those that attributed to The State that they base Islam in the lands of apostasy, and such lies upon the Islamic State and a mere slander)[166].

The Islamic State in advanced times started to not validate the Islam of those that live under the rule of an apostate and those whose land became the land of apostasy, so Turkī al-Binʿalī responded on this detail and relayed previous quotes of al-Zarqāwī and others establishing that the general population of ahl sunnah in Iraq and Shaam are Muslims!!! [167]

[166] Statement: Liyahlika man halaka 'an bayyinah, Page 4, 17 May 2017.
[167] Responding to the statement Lajnah A-lMafodah – Page 15.

The other point: Does the ruling with taghoot and ruling by it have to be in the form of institutions sponsored by the state?! Meaning the image of ruling with taghoot and ruling by it doesn't happen except through the ruler or through the ruling party?!

The answer: No, rather ruling by and with taghoot could happen by individuals in the community and not government institutions, as mentioned by Ibn Jareer AlTabari in his tafseer of the ayah: (Have you not seen those who claim to have believed in what was revealed to you, [O Muhammad], and what was revealed before you? They wish to refer legislation to Taghut, while they were commanded to reject it; and Satan wishes to lead them far astray).

He mentioned the narration of Al Siddi in which he mentioned the story of the disagreement of the Jews of which some became Muslim and some became hypocrites: (They entered Madina to Abi Burdah the soothsayer from Aslam, the hypocrites from Quraydah and Nadheer said: depart to Abi Burdah to repulse between us! And the Muslims from Quraydah and Nadheer said: no rather the Prophet peace be upon him to repulse between us, so let's go to him! The hypocrites refused, and they departed to Abi Burdah and asked him).

So this person is a taghoot and referred legislation to him and he has no relation to the ruling side at that time which is the prophetic rule!

It could happen that a person is a taghoot and legislation is referred to him without there being a relation to the authority or government institutions.

Likewise the questioner says in his question: (is their land considered land of war and would there be a judgmental war between us and them? Or do we not rule that they are apparent disbelievers except in the situation of real war).

Another proof that he speaks about taifah mumtani'ah and not about the people under the rule of this taifah with his question is war and fighting them clarified from their ruling and can we through it rule upon them with kufr?!

Here an issue is signaled in which the Shuyukh of Jihad differed upon, regarding the removal of excuses of the taifah mumtani'ah – upon kufr – when war happens, from the Shuyukh who made war authorized by execution of the rulings of apostasy in fighting contrary to a peaceful situation, Shaykh 'Atiyyatullah al-Lībī said:

(**But do we declare disbelief on everyone joining the army? The answer: as for during the time of peace and ease then no, as for during wartime, in the situation that we would be engaged in a war with one of the apostate countries, then we fight it's army as if they are apostates and abstainers from the legislation of Allah**)[168].

The other question, why did I not put the entire question of Shaykh 'Ali Al Khudayr in my book?!

[168] from which there is no breakdown in answering the Turkish mujahideen – Page 17.

The answer: So that I would not put all these clarifications behind it! Because those that caught up with the disagreements which do not end regarding the issues of taifah mumtani'ah in the jihadi circles and had the most basic information, he would have understood it instantly!

* * *

But in general does the manhaj and the rootings of Shaykh 'Ali Al Khudayr agree with the manhaj of The Islamic State?!

There are other points Shaykh Al Khudayr disagreed upon with the Islamic State, especially the points that they throw others with of descriptions of going astray and misguidance, and some of these points the Shaykh has fallen into it (according to The State).

Shaykh 'Ali Al Khudayr is known that he sees parliaments as disbelief and parliamentarians as mushrikeen however he excluded one category from parliamentarians and did not declare them disbelievers despite their participation in parliament, he said about this category: (**That he does not swear upon the constitution, and does not make laws nor participates in legislating that contradicts the shari'a rather he rejects it and votes against it then this person is misguided, at fault and a transgressor against the guidance of The Messenger peace be upon him in changing and correcting and establishing the Islamic State, but he is not a disbeliever**)[169].

Therefor if one of them made ijtihad and participated in the parliament but he did not swear on respecting the constitution (like the Islamists did in the Egyptian parliament when they swore to respect the constitution on what does not contradict the shar' of Allah, and as for what does contradict the shar' of Allah they did not swear upon respecting it completely built upon that they did not swear upon respecting disbelief and which in itself is disbelief) and did not participate in legislating but rather they were satisfied in voting against any law that contradicts the shari'a, this person is a Muslim for Shaykh 'Ali Al Khudayr!

However The Islamic State declared all parliamentarians disbelievers without exceptions and added upon it declaring anyone that all the voters for it are disbelievers as well!

And considered every person that does not declare parliamentarians and those that vote for them disbelievers as misguided and astray! If Abū Muṣʿab Al-Suri was believed astray and misguided by the Islamic State because he did not declare the voters in parliamentary elections disbelievers how did he not declare disbelief on all parliamentarians themselves and excluded one category?!

Without a doubt this characteristic of misguidance includes Shaykh 'Ali Al Khudayr.

And we spoke about these points in detail in the second part of the series (Current situation of the Jihadi movement).

---

[169] Salafist Forums answers – Page 47.

* * *

Likewise Shaykh ‘Ali Al Khudayr permits peaceful protests and he does not forbid it completely rather it is allowed in certain situations, he says: (as for general strikes as a means to overthrow governments and to reach authority or sit-ins or marches then this is not from the path of Ahlu Sunnah and Jama’ah, as for using that in a way to deny evil and to object to evil and falsehood and to declare absence of contentment or in a way to support upon good; then this is another situation and in origin it is allowed if there were no correct shar’i disadvantages).

Whereas The Islamic State here threw Al Qaida with being astray only because they stopped believing in peaceful (demonstrations)! Here Shaykh ‘Ali Al Khudayr is not only believing in it rather he allows it!

* * *

Therefore The Islamic State published a note soon after describing Shaykh ‘Ali Al Khudayr that he is a confused person in the note was mentioned:

- التبيان لما وقع في الضوابط منسوباً لأهل السنة بلا برهان
- التنبيهات على ما في كلام الريس من الورطات والأغلوطات
- إنجاح حاجة السائل في أهم المسائل (تنبيه: في هذه الرسالة خطأ في اشتراطه الانحياز إلى أرض خاصة بالموحدين لجواز الجهاد)

- علي الخضير: له اضطراب في مسألة علماء الطواغيت والمرتدين البرلمانيين (يُفهم من بعض كلامه أنه لا يكفّر بعض البرلمانيين) وغيرها من المسائل، وخالف الإجماع القديم في عد الفرق الرافضية والباطنية مرتدة لا كافرة أصلية، ويستشهد باللجنة الدائمة السلولية في مسائل ما جعله يضطرب في مسألة تكفير من لم يكفّر المشركين المرتدين، لكن نظرا للفائدة الموجودة في بعض كتبه ورسائله، يُسمح بطباعة الكتب والرسائل التالية <u>فقط</u> مع مراعاة الملاحظات السابقة:

- التوضيح والتتمات على كشف الشبهات
- المتممة لكلام أئمة الدعوة في مسألة الجهل في الشرك الأكبر
- الوجازة في شرح الأصول الثلاثة
- الوسيط في شرح أول رسالة في مجموعة التوحيد
- الحقائق في التوحيد (تنبيه: خالف منهج الدولة الإسلامية بعدّه الطوائف الرافضية والباطنية كفّار أصليين، ولهذا القول لوازم فاسدة في أحكام قتالهم، وهو مخالف للإجماع القديم).
- الجمع والتجريد في شرح كتاب التوحيد (تنبيه: الكتاب يحتوي على اضطرابه في مسألة تكفير المرتدين البرلمانيين).
- المعتصر شرح كتاب التوحيد (تنبيه: الكتاب يحتوي على اضطرابه في مسألة تكفير المرتدين البرلمانيين).

- ناصر الفهد: له اضطراب في مسألة علماء الطواغيت وشرك الطواف والاستشفاع وتكفير من لم يكفّر المشركين المرتدين والقتال تحت راية كفرية وغيرها من المسائل، لكن نظرا للفائدة الموجودة في بعض كتبه ورسائله، يُسمح بطباعة الكتب والرسائل التالية <u>فقط</u> مع مراعاة الملاحظات السابقة:

- إقامة البرهان على وجوب كسر الأوثان
- الرد على الرد على جريدة الوطن في مقال هدم التماثيل من منظور إسلامي
- التبيان في كفر من أعان الأمريكان <u>الجزء الأول فقط (أما الجزء الثاني فممنوع)</u>
- الدولة العثمانية وموقف دعوة الشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب منها
- تنبيهات على كتب تخريج كتاب التوحيد
- حقيقة الحضارة الإسلامية
- حكم استخدام أسلحة الدمار الشامل ضد الكفار
- رسالة في قصر المسافر خلف المقيم
- لباس المرأة أمام النساء
- منهج المتقدمين في التدليس
- صيانة مجموع الفتاوى من السقط والتصحيف

تنبيه: السماح لطباعة أي كتاب من الكتب المذكورة في هذه الورقات لا تعني الموافقة على جميع محتواها.

وجزاكم الله خيرا.

2

يعمم على ... ولاية ...

٠٦/ ١٢/ ١٤٣٧ هـ

٢٨/ ٠٩/ ٢٠١٦ م

الدولة الإسلامية — والي ولاية ...

الدولة الإسلامية — ... الدعوة والمساجد — ... ولاية ...

(ʻ**Ali Al Khudayr has some confusions in the issues of the palace scholars and apostates and parliamentarians, - it is understood from some of his words that he does not consider some parliamentarians disbelievers-, and other issues, and he went against the old consensus in considering the rafidhi batini sects as apostates not as original disbelievers, and he cites the Saluli Standing Committee in issues which made him confused in the issues of making takfeer on those that do not make takfeer on the mushrikeen and apostates**).

So they forbade printing some of his books and allowed some to be printed with the warning that he is a confused person.

Perhaps it is curious; that they did not forbid printing books of those Shuyukh that did not criticize them, or it was ascribed to them that they pledged allegiance to them – Like Shaykh Naser Al Fahd – rather the situation reached to the point of constriction upon the office of research and study or what is called Diwan Al-Ifta managed by Turkī al-Binʿalī. Abu Muhammad Al-Hashimi the deputy of Turkī al-Binʿalī and one of the opponents of the Hāzimi manhaj ,who started to control after controlling the Lajnah Al Mafudah, said:

(**It is sufficient for you to know that the important office forbade printing most books of the office of research and study and producing them – which in all are seven volumes – with the excuse of lack of funds!!! And most of what was printed and produced from the office was with donations from the muhsineen of the brothers, and there was massive pressure on Turkī al-Binʿalī in transferring researches and students of knowledge to the office**)[170].

And the men are still on the manhaj that approaches the manhaj of Turkī al-Binʿalī for he does takfeer on Jabhat Nusra and other groups, so that it is not said that this person is sympathetic with Al-Qaida or other groups to omit their testimony!

After these students of knowledge had pledged allegiance to this State and supported it and wrote in supporting it and determining its legitimacy through books, articles, letters and recordings, the State rewarded them with marginalization, exclusion and they lived and died and were outcasts before that!!!

Then they expect that the situation of the scholars that did not support them nor wrote anything against them would be in a better situation than those students of knowledge that supported it and immigrated to it!!! They assume that their state consider them slightly like the example of those scholars.

* * *

[170] Al Naseehah Al Hashimiyyah – Page 12.

The objector said: (*To highlight them all would require a separate book to be written and one clear example is sufficient*).

If the brother has many proofs from my words then I wish and request from him to gather them all in a book so we can see if he is truthful or not. And I wish that he would undertake this work immediately, and me and the readers will wait for it.

And our last supplication that praise be to Allah, Lord of the worlds.

* * *

Question: **Can you clarify to us the issue that is spread by ISIS that the Taliban say Iran are our brothers and are an Islamic state, and that they say Qatar are our brothers and an Islamic state, they also say "May Allah preserve him" about the Ameer of Qatar, therefor ISIS claims that the Taliban have left the circle of Islam. How do you answer this?**

Answer: There are some citations that I put previously that can be used for multiple purposes! And I will again copy them here, among these citations is what Shaykh Ayman al-Zawāhirī mentioned in his letter to al-Zarqāwī : (And why are the laymen of the Shi'a killed while they are excused for their ignorance?)[171].

Despite that this saying is what was agreed upon from the leadership in Khorasan; Shaykh Atiyatullah al-Lībī said in his letter to al-Zarqāwī speaking about the letter from Dr. Ayman: (**And I saw their word gathered upon a collection of notifications and directions, you can find their summary in the letter of the Dr., which represents the ideas of the brothers, the scholars and the scientific and literary leadership present in it**)[172].

Al-Qaeda at the time of Usamah sent a letter directly to the leadership present in Iraq which mentioned that it agreed in this letter on not declaring takfeer upon the Shi'a because they are excused for their ignorance!

What did al 'Adnānī say? Despite this all he said: (**This is the Al Qaeda that we loved, this is the Al Qaeda that we followed, this is the Al-Qaeda that we supported**)[173].

So he loved Al-Qaeda and supported it and followed it despite that it informed the leadership that they do not declare takfeer upon the Shi'a!

And Abū Muḥmmad al-Maqdisī who does not declare takfeer upon the laymen of the Shi'a you will see him say: (**I, in reality have an opinion about this issue; I am upon the madhab of Ibn Taymiyyah, in not declaring takfeer upon the laymen of the Shi'a**)[174].

---

[171] Letter from Dr. Ayman al-Zawāhirī to Abū Muṣʿab al-Zarqāwī – Page 13.
[172] Letter from 'Atiyatullah al-Lībī to Abū Muṣʿab al-Zarqāwī – Page 8.
[173] My apologies Oh Ameer of Al-Qaeda, Al-Furqan foundation , May 2014.

Did Shaykh Abū Muṣʽab al-Zarqāwī tell him that he committed disbelief?!

Rather he said replying to him: (and before concluding it must be said; that Shaykh al-Maqdisī may Allah preserve among those that preserve their rights and tribulations, and he is among those that are thought well of, and he is most entitled from the people to be excused and dismissed from the mistakes, and I do not think any muwahhid in this time except that the Shaykh has a favor upon them, this does not mean that the side of being correct in an issue that his position knowledge or predecessors and tribulations are lowered)[175].

Even Abū Baṣīr al-Ṭarṭūsī said in his book: (**The Rafidhah are a faction of shirk and apostasy) what follows: (despite our sternness that the Twelver Shi'a as a faction…are a faction of apostasy upon which all the rules of an apostate faction are applied…except that we stop being stern in the takfeer of those affiliated to this misguided faction on individuals for the likelihood that obstacles are present that hinder declaring them disbelievers**)[176].

Thus he does not declare every individual of the Rawafidh and stops there, however the president of the Shar'i committee in Al-Qaeda in Iraq Maysarah al-Gharīb said: (**In agreement to what the scholars of tawheed clarified in their books, there is an important book by "Abū Baṣīr" titled: "Al Rawafidh are a faction of shirk and apostasy"**)[177].

He described him as a scholar of tawheed and advised reading this book despite that in this book there is no takfeer upon the laymen of the Shi'a.

Then why is the Taliban an exception from these all?! And this clarifies to you that the manhaj of Al-Qaeda in Iraq and the manhaj of Abū Muṣʽab al-Zarqāwī is different from the manhaj of ISIS, otherwise if the manhaj was one the ruling would be one!

As for the words on the taghout of Qatar, and supplicating for him and making him a muslim, and that this is the reason for takfeer, the answer on that is what we mentioned in this series. Ibn 'Uthaymeen and Ibn Bāz made their ruler wali amr muslim, and defended him and published fatwas to establish his rule and supplicated for his preservation and care, and with that al-Zarqāwī did not declare them disbelievers, and then the coordinator that used to smuggle fighters claimed that this was al-Zarqāwī manhaj, al-Zarqāwī became furious for attributing this saying to him and he said that he does not declare them disbelievers! [178]

So we notice that al-Zarqāwī and the president of the Shar'i committee did not do takfeer on people that do not do takfeer on all Shi'a, and did not declare takfeer on those that made the rulers

[174] Interview with Al-Jazeerah channel, July 2005.
[175] Complete archive of speeches and lectures by Shaykh Abū Muṣʽab al-Zarqāwī – Page 335.
[176] The Shi'a Rawafidh, a faction of shirk and apostasy – Page 63.
[177] Fighting the Shi'a in Iraq…The ruling and wisdom – Page 7.
[178] Zarqāwī how I knew him by Maysarah al-Gharīb – Page 35.

Muslim like Ibn Bāz and Ibn ‘Uthaymeen and whom produced fatwas in establishing their rule and granting it legitimacy!

And now you know that al 'Adnānī was a contradictory person when he said: (**and be reassured soldiers of The Islamic State; for we by the permission of Allah continue on the manhaj of the Imam Shaykh Usamah, and the ameer of the martyrs Abū Muṣ‘ab al-Zarqāwī**)[179].

Their manhaj became the opposite of the manhaj of Abū Muṣ‘ab al-Zarqāwī in issues like we mentioned above.

And when they feel that you are competing with them, suddenly you become an apostate and a disbeliever, and after the soldiers of the Islamic State appeared in an official publication (Saleel Sawarim part 2) used to sing in praise to the Taliban and its leader! Suddenly they transformed into disbelievers and apostates!!

The Taliban that described Iran that they are an Islamic country in an official statement in the month June 2013 and opened its office in Qatar and complimented the taghout of Qatar in the same month and same year! Nevertheless the Islamic State published a statement in March 2014 in which they deny that they declare Taliban disbelievers and it said that was a fabrication ascribed to them! [180]

This issue was repeated not only with the Taliban, even with Al-Qaeda, when they became a possible competition, the praise became takfeer, the laughable thing is that the issues that ISIS declared them disbelievers Al-Qaeda did before their disagreement with ISIS!

Shaykh Ayman al-Zawāhirī said: (**My decision about the problems in Syria was published to preserve the blood of the Muslims, so they – ISIS – uncovered their true face, so I became a disbeliever to them after I was a wise scholar, and this proves that their takfeer is utilitarian, political, to seize power and to monopolize leadership, upon the madhab: do takfeer to blow up and to seize**)[181].

All of this confirms that the reason are not these issues rather it is only (to be a potential competitor), so why was the Taliban not declared disbelievers by ISIS in the statement that they published despite all of their actions which they claim that they committed disbelief through it! And when they became potential competitors they became apostates! And this confirms the correct statement of Shaykh Dr. Ayman al-Zawāhirī.

Adding to that, Al-Qaeda has refuted upon the Taliban these relations and some of the descriptions which they used to describe these countries, the Taliban answered through the commander Muhammad Al-Tayib and said:

---

[179] This was never our Manhaj and never will, Al-Furqan foundation, April 2014.
[180] Statement clarifying the stance of ISIS on the fabricated articles, 1 March 2014.
[181] Bunyanun Marsoos, Sahab Foundation.

(**Yes, bootlicking (these countries) is not allowed in this rightly guided shar'iah, but where is the bootlicking in merely building relations? Meaning that this relation is not and will not be built on the foundation of any concession of the fundaments, as for merely nicknaming according to the conventional and familiar, in the correspondence of the Messenger peace be upon him with some of the disbelievers proves to us that it is allowed rather perhaps advisable if there was hope in their Islam great or for benefit, for it was mentioned in Saheeh Bukhari the text of the Messenger peace be upon him to Heraclius: "In the name of Allah the most beneficent, most merciful, from Muhammad servant of Allah and his Messenger to Heraclius the Great of Rome.." Ibn Hajar said after mentioning the difference of opinion between the scholars in nicknaming the polytheist which includes praising him: "In the generality of the foregoing, or from fear of fitna, it is permissible without restriction, and Allaah knows best", and it's not hidden that using the word great in contemporary times is of far greater and stronger significance from the conventional nicknames today between the national relations like his excellency the president of the republic or his majesty the prime minister or others. But the issue in that returns to the conventional between the people not to specific nickname or word in all times and places, rather for every community and each time has its own terms specific to it**)[182].

Even if we wanted to take examples in the difference regarding the disbelief of a faction or individual, then we would take as example the mufassir AlAlusi whom did not declare Ibn 'Arabi the atheist heretic a disbeliever, about whom Ibn Taymiyyah has harsh words regarding him and regarding those that do not declare disbelief on him and stops with him! Because of suspicion in some of the kufri expressions of ibn 'Arabi, the scholars did not declare Al-Alusi a disbeliever for that!

Shaykh Atiyatullah al-Lībī said while commenting on this: (**Have you seen the scholars declaring takfeer on Ibn 'Arabi – and how many they are – declaring takfeer on individuals that don't do takfeer from among their brothers of the scholars, and how many they are as well? Rather they declared takfeer on those that did not see the misguidance of the person Ibn 'Arabi, and have they usedwith them them ruling "Those that do not takfeer on a disbeliever is a disbeliever" or announced it with the drawn out sword or destructive weapons in the face of those that disagreed with them and argued with then in his disbelief and apostasy?! And this only because of their strong vision and steadfastness in knowledge and precaution in religion and their knowledge of excuses, and some of our scholars used to say: the more knowledge a scholar has the clearer his vision becomes in regards to the excuses for the people**)[183].

Likewise the situation with Ibn Hajar Al-Haytami Al-Makki, Shaykh 'Atiyatullah al-Lībī said: (**And he used to fight for the people of shirk and graveworship; he allowed in some of his books the supplicating for help from other than Allah Almighty and defended the polytheists that supplicated for help from other than Allah from among the awliyaa and their shrines, and his**

[182] Letter of Muhammad Al-Tayib – Page 6,7.
[183] Answering the question of defensive Jihad – Page 18.

calamity from this door is known, and with that he was not declared a disbeliever by the scholars and excused him for what he has of interpretation and greatness of favor and old roots in knowledge and jurisprudence, among them scholars of the najdi da'wah as mentioned in Durar Al-Sunniyah in the letter of Shaykh 'Abdullah Ibn Muhammad Ibn 'Abd AlWahhab may Allah have mercy on them)[184].

Review the book of Shaykh 'Atiyatullah (Answering the question of defensive Jihad – Page 17,18) to see all the articles and their sources about the situation of these two scholars!

So the Taliban is excused as these two scholars are excused.

[184] Answering the question of defensive Jihad – Page 18.